

# Anglican Theological Review



EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT and BURTON S. EASTON

FOUNDED BY SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

VOLUME XXIX

APRIL, 1947

NUMBER 2

## CONTENTS

God and the World: Their Relationship as Seen in Jewish Prophecy .....	<i>W. Norman Pittenger</i>	57
Unity within the Protestant Episcopal Church .....	<i>Edward L. Parsons</i>	62
Authority and Freedom in Worship (Church Congress Syllabus 46) .....	<i>Alden Drew Kelley</i>	71
Hooker's Doctrine of God .....	<i>John S. Marshall</i>	81
The Antecedents of the High-Priest Theme in Hebrews .....	<i>Mary E. Clarkson</i>	89
"Blessed is He that Cometh in the Name of the Lord" .....	<i>Cyril C. Richardson</i>	96
Dr. Cirlot on Apostolic Succession .....	<i>Sherman E. Johnson</i>	99
Books Reviews .....		104
Notes on New Books .....		117

PUBLISHED BY

ANGLICAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

600 HAVEN STREET  
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

PRINCE AND LEMON STS.  
LANCASTER, PENNSYLVANIA

\$1.00 A NUMBER

\$3.00 A YEAR

# Anglican Theological Review

VOLUME XXIX

APRIL, 1947

NUMBER 2

EDITOR: THE REV. FREDERICK CLIFTON GRANT, D.D., Th.D., D.S.Litt., Professor of Biblical Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York City

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: THE REV. BURTON SCOTT EASTON, S.T.D., Ph.D., Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation, General Theological Seminary

BOOK REVIEW EDITOR: THE REV. HOLT HUTTON GRAHAM, M.A., Instructor in New Testament, Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

SECRETARY AND TREASURER: THE REV. PERCY VARNEY NORWOOD, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Professor of Church History, Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

## EDITORIAL BOARD

REV. ARTHUR ADAMS, Ph.D.  
RT. REV. DONALD B. ALDRICH, D.D.  
PROF. FRANK W. BUCKLER, S.T.D.  
RT. REV. WALLACE E. CONKLING, D.D.  
RT. REV. ANGUS DUN, D.D.  
RT. REV. RICHARD S. M. EMBICH, Ph.D.  
REV. CHARLES D. FEILDING, M.A.  
REV. JOSEPH F. FLETCHER, S.T.D.  
REV. ARTHUR HAIRE FORSTER, Ph.D.  
REV. H. E. W. FOSBROKE, D.D., LL.D.  
REV. ROBERT McQUEEN GRANT, Th.D.  
RT. REV. WALTER H. GRAY, D.D.  
PROF. LEWIS M. HAMMOND, Ph.D.  
REV. FLEMING JAMES, D.D.  
REV. ALDEN DREW KELLEY, D.D.  
REV. PAUL STEVENS KRAMER, Ph.D.  
REV. LEICESTER C. LEWIS, S.T.D., Ph.D.  
REV. CHARLES W. LOWRY, JR., Ph.D.  
PROF. JOHN S. MARSHALL, Ph.D.  
RT. REV. FRANK A. McELWAIN, D.D.  
REV. DANIEL A. MCGREGOR, Ph.D.

REV. SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, D.D., Ph.D.  
REV. RANDOLPH C. MILLER, Ph.D.  
REV. ARNOLD S. NASH, D.D.  
RT. REV. NORMAN B. NASH, S.T.D.  
RT. REV. EDWARD L. PARSONS, D.D.  
REV. HOWARD C. ROBBINS, D.D.  
REV. LAWRENCE ROSE, D.D.  
REV. MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR., Ph.D.  
RT. REV. HENRY KNOX SHERRILL, D.D.  
REV. HENRY H. SHIRES, D.D.  
REV. CUTHBERT A. SIMPSON, Th.D.  
REV. CHARLES L. STREET, Ph.D.  
RT. REV. ROBERT E. L. STRIDER, D.D.  
REV. JOHN W. SUTER, JR., D.D.  
REV. CHARLES L. TAYLOR, JR., Th.D.  
RT. REV. BEVERLEY D. TUCKER, D.D.  
RT. REV. H. ST. GEORGE TUCKER, D.D.  
PROF. JOACHIM WACH, Ph.D.  
REV. THEODORE OTTO WEDEL, Ph.D.  
REV. WALTER FREEMAN WHITMAN, D.D.  
REV. ALEXANDER C. ZABRISKIE, S.T.D.

## COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS

BERKELEY DIVINITY SCHOOL, New Haven, Connecticut  
THE CHURCH CONGRESS OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH  
CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC, Berkeley, California  
EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL, Cambridge, Massachusetts  
GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, Chelsea Square, New York City  
KENYON COLLEGE, Gambier, Ohio

NASHOTAH HOUSE, Nashotah, Wisconsin  
TRINITY COLLEGE, Hartford, Connecticut  
TRINITY COLLEGE, Toronto, Ontario  
UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH, Sewanee, Tennessee  
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY IN VIRGINIA, Alexandria, Virginia  
SEABURY-WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, Evanston, Illinois

The REVIEW is published four times a year, as follows: Winter, Spring, Summer, and Autumn numbers. Subscription price \$3.00 annually. Single copies, \$1.00.

All editorial communications and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, the Rev. Frederick C. Grant, 3041 Broadway, New York 27, New York.

Subscriptions should be sent to the Treasurer, the Rev. Percy V. Norwood, 600 Haven Street, Evanston, Illinois.

Books for review should be sent to the Book Review Editor, the Rev. Holt H. Graham, 600 Haven Street, Evanston, Illinois.

Entered as second-class matter, August 8, 1931, at the post-office at Evanston, Illinois, under the act of March 3, 1879; with additional entry at the post-office at Lancaster, Pennsylvania.







# Anglican Theological Review

EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT AND BURTON S. EASTON

Founded by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

---

VOLUME XXIX

APRIL, 1947

NUMBER 2

---

## GOD AND THE WORLD: THEIR RELATIONSHIP AS SEEN IN JEWISH PROPHECY

By W. NORMAN PITTENGER

General Theological Seminary

The purpose of this paper is to discuss certain significant points involved in the general question of the relationship of God and the world, as this is reflected in the attitude of the Jewish prophets; and for our special object, Deutero-Isaiah, who represents the most developed Jewish prophetic teaching concerning God in his creative-redemptive work in the world, has been chosen. After a study of his views, we shall conclude with some comments on the change which Christian belief makes in this matter.

At the outset it ought to be noted that we cannot find in the writings collected under the name Deutero-Isaiah any developed metaphysical position, in the strict sense of the word. It was not the genius of the Hebrew mind to formulate a system of concepts which might be called metaphysical; its special bent was in another direction. But having said so much, it is essential to add that although there never was any carefully articulated Hebrew metaphysic, there most certainly was a world-outlook which was

to all intents and purposes the equivalent of a metaphysic.

By this we mean that the Hebrew prophets were really concerned with the very problems which engaged the attention of thinkers among other people, notably the Greeks, who saw them in more strictly conceptual terms. As a matter of fact, one may well doubt if this conceptual interest is true even of the Greeks *as a people*; perhaps it was true only of a small portion of their intellectual leaders, if the position of Rohde in his great work *Psyche* (which treats this entire subject) is acceptable. In any event, for the Jews the primary concern was not with *τὸ ὄν*, or with the relations of that unitary being to the multifarious world of phenomena; rather, for them the great question was the nature of the living God and his vital control of the most minute details of human and cosmic event. The Jewish view of the world, it may be suggested, was the result of two factors in their experience. *First* there was a profound realization of the impact of God upon

the individual soul: what we might describe as an awareness, in a manner or mode which roughly may be called intuitive or quasi-mystical, of the constant pressure upon man of a Reality not himself. With that Reality he must come to terms if ever he was to find peace for himself. Furthermore, the action of that Reality was operative in a varied manner, intensified in certain great moments but yet intimately concerned with every remotest reach of his life. *In the second place*, there was a recognition in the sphere of history of a purposive activity which seemed to be working out a great plan. This activity was certainly apprehended more especially in relation to their own particular nation, but it included all men, and it certainly also involved the cosmic forces which surround and sustain the world of human affairs.

To these two empirically ascertained factors must be added a *third*, which penetrated and permeated them both: the conviction that the Reality which was operative in the field of history and was intimately related to the lives of individual men, was also the God who destroyed and made new, the destructive and yet constructive deity who thundered from Mount Sinai, who passed through his world like a fierce storm, who exalted the valleys and made low the hills.

Certainly we have here a view of God which is quite similar to and yet very different from that reached by others in a more strictly speculative manner. We have presented to us, as a *given* of immediate religious experience, a concept of Reality which finds that supreme being to be ultimate power, which sees his action in the whole range of phenomena, and which recognizes him as

energizing in the individual human soul as well. It was such a quick, intuitive reading of human experience—the perception that there is a Reality in and behind things which presses in on men's lives and moulds both them and the process of history to its own ends—it was this which was behind the Jewish contribution to world thought. And its special value rests in the fact that it is the result of a warm and personal knowledge, by acquaintance and not at second-hand. Metaphysics is on the whole a rather chilly affair; but to grasp, as in a flash, the truth about the Living God and his relationship with our world is to alter one's whole view of the nature of things, to call one up sharply to higher levels of living, and to open out wider vistas of meaning both for our own lives and for the world in which they are set.

All this has been rather by way of preface; yet it has not been lost time if we have clearly in our minds, as a consequence, that the Jewish people were dealing with problems of universal significance, and contributing answers of an equal importance. Indeed, because of the very conditions under which they handled these problems, the very forms in which their answers were given, we may assert that the results are of vastly more importance than the speculations of Greeks or Hindus—they come from realistic contact with real things, seen with clear eyes and accepted with the whole being.

Let us now set down, briefly, the outlook upon the world which is found in Deutero-Isaiah's writings. One will be struck almost immediately by the insistence on the transcendence of God: "Behold, the nations are as a drop from the bucket, and are accounted as the

small dust of the balance." To God there can be no likeness; he is Other than man, he is the "high and lofty one who inhabiteth eternity." But there is another side to the picture. God is also in close contact with the affairs of the world. He is, in the first place, the Creator. By his act, the heavens and the earth were made; "he hath laid the foundations of the earth," and his "right hand hath spread out the heavens." Nor is this creative act merely a past event; it is continuous—if there is one thing which comes through to us from reading this prophet, it is the constant, the never-ceasing creative activity of God, ceaselessly at work in the world, sustaining it at every moment, and always declaring "new things," "coming things." One might even say that there is an evolutionary view of creation, if one were not afraid of reading modern thought into the prophet. It is God "who created the heavens and stretched them out, who spread abroad the earth and its produce, who giveth breath to the people upon it, and his spirit to those who walk therein." It is also he who will cause the earth to open her womb, so that "salvation and peace may shoot forth," and the world be renewed according to his will.

But God's creativity is not exhausted in the natural world; it is found most especially in the historic sequence. Here God is working out a purpose, a purpose which will not be defeated, for as he has planned it so will he bring it to pass; as he has spoken, so he will do. There is a plan; and to the fulfilment of that plan, God has raised up Cyrus, who "giveth nations before him, and subdueth kings beneath him." And this purpose involves all nations, Egypt and many another; but chiefly it is con-

cerned with Israel, for them has God chosen to himself. Through a particular people, and through their loyalty to his purpose, God will concentrate his creative action so that there will be brought to pass on earth a new creation, "where darkness will be light, and crooked places straight." Into that new creation all nations will come, that they may share in an abundant life which God has purposed for men. Towards this end, all things work; even the wrath of men is made to serve it, for God overrules every single aspect of natural and historic movement, and is himself directing it towards the fulfilment of his purpose.

Deutero-Isaiah lays special stress on the intimate relationship of God to the Jewish nation. "I Yahweh have called thee in righteousness, and have held thy hand"—the Jews have been chosen for himself, and through them there will come "redemption for the people," "a light for the Gentiles." The relationship of Israel to the Ruler of history is no external one; it is more tender than that of a husband for his wife. Indeed, God has formed Israel for himself; he made this nation from the womb, and its errors, its sins, and its sufferings, have weighed heavily upon him. Whatever the Jews may have suffered, it was a remedial punishment, and betokened no loss of love by God towards his people: "For a small moment have I rejected thee, but with everlasting mercies will I gather thee." Towards Israel God has great loving-kindness, far deeper than that of the mother nursing her child. But, as we have indicated above this relationship to Israel is not the end. For through that special relationship to the Jews, God will bring all men to himself, in a

glad surrender to him as he has revealed himself to men.

This purpose in history does not exhaust the prophet's conception of the relationship of God to his world. For there is the contact of the individual with Yahweh. God is one who must be sought where he may be found; but he is also one who is near to those who call upon him. He would have men come to him that they may quench their thirst; it is his bread which alone will satisfy them. In loving communion with him they may go forth with joy, be led forth with peace. He will go with them, not merely as Leader of a nation of Jews, but as a Friend and Companion, personally and intimately, on their return to Palestine. He speaks to the prophet as a man to his friend. He raises the fallen, restores those who are cast down; he is the God who hideth himself, and yet is known in the secret recesses of the heart. Those whom he loves he has graven on the palms of his hands, and they are ever before him.

These are the fundamental elements in Deutero-Isaiah's view of God and his relationship to the world. Now let us recapitulate, so that we may go on to consider this world-outlook from our own point of view. To Deutero-Isaiah God is the transcendent and personal Reality who controls the whole course of cosmic and historic development. On the other hand he is a God who is eternally creative, and who by that eternal creativity is renewing and remaking the world, so that redemption is as it were the other side of creation. He has a purpose which is to be effected in the world, and which nothing can turn back, and towards the fulfilment of which he takes direct action among

men. His objective is a "kingdom of ends," where through a special revelation made to one nation all peoples may be brought into fulness of life in him. He is the God of personal religion, known in the secret heart of his children. He is to be approached with awe, adoration, mystery; but also with trust and joy. He is righteous, consistent, purposive, creative; and he loves his people with an everlasting love.

Now obviously such a world-outlook is behind all specifically Christian thought. Often enough we have permitted the static conceptions of Greek metaphysics, valuable in their own way, to blot out or to blur this insistence on the ceaseless dynamic activity of God, his creation and re-creation, his energizing in the cosmos, in history and in the souls of men. But we do this at our peril. Likewise, the notion of purpose, achieved through the raising up of new and significant personalities, is something which we find at the heart of the Christian faith. And that God's purpose will be achieved, whether we co-operate or not, in spite of and through our obstinacy and recalcitrance—all of this is essential to Christianity.

Where we may feel that the prophet goes astray in emphasis is in his—at least apparent—reduction of freedom in the creation. So overwhelming is his sense of God's majesty and greatness that he forgets that God's love as creative act has necessarily involved a certain limited freedom for that which he has made. In the end, the divine purpose cannot be defeated, but in the attainment of that purpose, God, by the consequences of his own act, must use free men—and his world has, we must believe, a relative independence in its details, although it is all, doubtless,

operative in the long run towards God's purposive end. Otherwise men become *automata* and the world a rigidly determined system, an act of God in the strictest and most immediate sense. It seems more consistent with God's character to conceive of the world as possessing a relative freedom, which is over-ruled and controlled by God, so that all his works do praise him, and out of man's folly and sin and whatever chance there may be in the nature of things, his great plan is wrought out to its glorious conclusion. Such a conception will fit in admirably with the creative activity of God, and with his re-creative and redemptive work in and through that which he has made; and it will enable us to see God more as the great artist than as a rather humdrum artificer; more as the poet than as the marionette director who pulls strings here and there as the somewhat jerky production goes on.

What of the relation of time and eternity? In Deutero-Isaiah there is no very explicit treatment of the subject. But certainly we may discover that for him God is *related* to the time-process in the sense that his purpose is the unity of history. That purpose is effectively carried out in the time-order, and so is the reflection in "one-after-another" manner of a plan made "once-for-all" in the mind of God—although it may be open to alteration in the light of events. Of the latter point one is not so sure—there is no indication in Deutero-Isaiah of the possibility that God may "change his mind"; he is self-consistent and cannot be swerved from his course. Yet there seem to be occasional references, especially in regard to Israel's attitude to God, which indicate

a new *method* of operation, if not a new plan. However, that newness of operation surely is consistent with a "once-for-all" plan made by God. In any event, Deutero-Isaiah, if he had thought in such terms at all, would have found time in some sense a reality for God, although not in the same sense in which it is a reality in our little span of life. One reason for this assertion is that he so closely links the purposive working of God, *in time*, with the heart of the divine being, that it seems impossible to conceive of his denying some sort of "experience" of the time-process to God.

Christians have been granted, through no merit of their own, but by the gracious loving-kindness of that same God whom Deutero-Isaiah declared, a more intimate and precious understanding of the depths of his being. Still he remains an unutterable mystery; but still he declares himself to us. He has declared himself pre-eminently, in a manner which is supreme, unique, sufficient, in Jesus Christ. We need not go into the intricacies of theology to feel that in that burning-center of divine self-revelation, where God and man are united in a love which passes all understanding, the witness of Deutero-Isaiah is not contradicted but rather is clarified and deepened. God who in times past spake unto the fathers by the prophets, has spoken unto us, has come to us, in one who was a Son. There still remain, and there will always remain, unfathomed depths of divinity which we can never know; but because Christ is the Son, of the same substance with divinity in all its fulness, we may say with an even surer voice than Deutero-Isaiah, "Our Father."



## UNITY WITHIN THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH

By THE RT. REV. EDWARD L. PARSONS

San Francisco

The unity of all Christians is obviously the will of God. The Church is therefore one in God's purpose and that means for Christians that the unity of the Church must be as definitely a part of their thinking as its holiness or catholicity or apostolicity. All the various movements of the present towards union or reunion may rightly claim the warrant of God's will so far as their goal is concerned and may with deep conviction seek his guidance as they strive to map their course towards that goal. But their response to his guidance may often be wrong, ill timed, without understanding. Humility, that is sincere acknowledgment of our own limitations, our prejudices and our sin, is of first importance.

When then a Church finds itself as does the Protestant Episcopal Church today in an utterly confused situation, such as that revealed at Philadelphia, concerning one particular proposal within the whole wide area of the ecumenical movement, it is natural and wise to say that we cannot get forward in this matter until we are united ourselves. Dr. Mabry and the many who have written and talked of this are right.

But we must see clearly what we mean by unity, or what we ought to mean. This paper is such an attempt. It is I hope and pray both humble and honest.

1. When then we turn to the facts of our own Church life and the problems they raise, the first matter of importance to confront us is without question the fact that the things which unite us are vastly more important than those which

divide us. We often forget this. The belief in one righteous and merciful God which unites Christians and Jews (shared to some degree by all who believe in the spiritual character of ultimate reality) if it is sincere orientates their lives in fundamental ways and thus sets them apart from the rest of the world. The faith of Christians brings a still deeper unity. Nothing, e.g., seems to me more completely contrary to the teachings of the Bible or the considerations of reason than the present day doctrine of the Papacy but my Roman Catholic friend is my brother in a sense in which my Moslem or Hindu or Confucian or even my Jewish friend can never be.

That is certainly true in still greater degree when it comes to the diversities of view within our own Church. They make a lot of difference on the surface. They go deep enough to produce harsh and bitter words but they don't really get to the springs of life as does our common faith. We all have God; we all have Christ; we all have the Holy Spirit; we all have the Church. We all have bishops, no matter what is our theory about them. We all have prayer; we all have the sacraments. Two men rise from their knees in Church, praise God, and go out into the world strengthened by the Communion. For their joyous and strong Christian life it makes very little difference whether one had gone to confession and the other had not, whether one had come fasting and the other had not. To the life of the ordinary Churchman it makes no practical difference

whether Apostolic Succession is a tactual affair of ordination or a symbol of the continuity of the great central Christian tradition. These things are of importance. I would be the last person to ignore them; but whatever their importance, it is far less than that of the things which we share. Of the detail and bearing of this I shall speak later.

2. But while that is true, it is also true that from another point of view these diversities within the Church are fundamental. They indicate roughly the two main groups into which clergy and people tend to fall. They are schools of thought if we are considering matters of doctrine. They are parties if for one reason or another questions have arisen which have definite bearings on habits of worship or ecclesiastical discipline. But whatever we may call them they are reflections in the Church of those conflicting movements in the social order which make our political parties and which set the eternal problem of that order: authority and freedom; order and liberty; the corporate group and the individual. The eternal problem is to find a satisfactory synthesis of these conflicting ideals. In the social order one or another movement becomes dominant over a long period of time. The medieval collective and authoritarian structure reaches its apex in the 13th and 14th centuries, gradually weakens and in the revolution of the renaissance and reformation gives way to individualism, nationalism and the exaltation of liberty. Thomas Aquinas yields to Descartes.

A century or more ago the tide had begun to turn again. Men were discovering that freedom must be found in community. They were looking for order and authority again. Collective

ideals began to dominate their minds and, as always, distorted expressions of them arose. Totalitarianism appeared in the state. In the Roman Church we have the authority of the Papacy carried to its logical extreme. In the larger life of Christianity we have the ecumenical movement feeling its way back to unity. In our own Church we have the revived emphasis upon the meaning of the Church and upon history. We have eyes turned towards Rome. The Anglo-Catholic movement is simply one of the obvious expressions in the Church of the growingly dominant movement of society. And as in society the bulk of the people live on without any great interest in either extreme except when a crisis arises, a revolution, American, French, German, or Russian, so in like manner in the Church (I speak now of our own) the people are content to be Prayer Book or, if it is a correct use of the term, Central Churchmen. They are like the great body of Americans who are disciples of neither the NAM nor the CIO. But all this is only to bring out the fact and to give it due weight that the parties in the Church express these immemorial antitheses in human nature and the social order. The High Churchman, the Anglo-Catholic of today, starts with authority and moves to the individual. The Evangelical starts with the individual and his freedom and moves to the Church. This is perhaps an oversimplified interpretation. It is true that many other factors enter in. All conservatives, e.g., are not authoritarian and many a liberal longs for authority. In the Church political views seem often to run quite counter to ecclesiastical positions. Furthermore there are innumerable diversities within these broad divisions. But the point is that in hu-



man problems diversity and especially diversity along two main lines is always there, and must be accepted.

There are two implications of such a view which bear directly upon unity. The first is that we have here permanent diversity. Just as in the state (here in America for example) each group finds a way to survive under the dominant order of the day but never ceases to move towards its own goal, so in the Church the dominance of one group or another is never complete. Wiclif and Hus were not the first Protestants. The Catholic ideals of the great Carolinians in the Church of England never died. There are plenty of Loisy and Tyrrells in the Roman Church today; and in a free Church as in a free society they would be heard. In other words unity does not and cannot mean uniformity. It does not and cannot mean that we are all to be converted to one point of view, one theological system and one interpretation of the Prayer Book. Neither Virginia nor Nashotah will convert the other however obviously desirable such a result may seem to some people or however many lesser differences find solution.

But any such result would in itself be a tragedy. The *life* of society lies in its diversities. The problem of society lies not in discovering how to get rid of diversities but in discovering how to adjust those diversities within a fundamental unity. We manage with reasonable success in America because we have back of our Constitution and our written law a faith in what we call democracy, very vague, very hard to define; certainly not held by many people with any real understanding of its implication but nevertheless a faith, and that faith recognizes that there can be no life

without freedom, diversity, parties, groups. All worthwhile society is dynamic, not static. Change, movement and conflict belong to its very essence. Our Rankin Committee and other Fascist-minded groups would not have it so. We tolerate them; but we would never accept their position. We live in what Croce, speaking of the liberal state, calls a "discordant harmony."

If we are to have unity in the Church it must be by the same kind of process as in the state, the recognition that we hold our unity in diversity or, more important, that we must hold our diversities in such fashion as not to break the underlying unity. We must welcome, not avoid, debate. We must never seek unity by covering up the differences, by claiming a unity or let us say a unanimity which does not exist. Debate, controversy, and conference are means of apprehending wider truth, understanding our religion better, making more real the deep fundamental unity. Debate is a process of sifting.

"Discordant harmony" is typical of the New Testament situation. A startling personality like St. Paul creates differences at once. Apollos, Cephas, Paul—there is the picture of a Church, not a sect, but there also, as Paul points out, is unity in Christ.

The first thing we have to remember then is that the things which unite go far deeper than those which divide. The second is that we cannot expect any Church life (unless we want to be a sect) which is in one sense other than a discordant harmony. We must welcome diversity. We must never think that unity or peace in the Church means either the conversion of all Church people to one way of thinking and action or the sup-

pression of differences by choking off discussion.

3. Before we come to the practical implications of these fundamental facts which so far as I can see must guide us in our search for the meaning of our own unity there is one further profoundly weighty matter to consider. I state it as a principle of policy that no unity in our own Church or our own Communion has anything more than a temporary validity unless it envisages the future unity of "the blessed company of all faithful people." Anything less is sectarian. Obviously in our own immediate unity questions concerning lesser matters will and must arise. It is right that they should. Some of those questions I shall touch on later. But we are not true to the Catholic conception of the Church if for example we exalt our own Prayer Book problem to universal importance. We have to remember that up to 400 years ago no Christian saint had ever seen the Prayer Book, and since that time only a very small percentage of the saintly lives which are the glory of Christianity have been nurtured on that book. We must learn to discriminate between these questions of temporary validity and those which concern the unity of the whole Church. We must never let the temporary and local assume first place in our thinking. We must look at all our problems in the light of our ideals for the future Church, the Church which in its unity will proclaim to the world both the authority and the freedom which are in Christ Jesus.

Within that great ecumenical unity the diversities must be very great for God made every man different from every other. In the human race he planted a rich and varied garden, not a field of

grain. I can think of nothing which can keep us from petty and unprofitable disputing and open the way to large and profitable discussion and debate more surely than to have always in our hearts the deep conviction that next to our responsibility to God, is our responsibility towards *all* Christ's people. All that we do must help to bring Christians together. The kind of Church we want is one big enough to offer a welcome to all who in sincerity name the name of Christ. Indeed that is the destiny which God has given us of the Anglican Communion to fulfill, and we must adventure for it. The only other alternative is to be a small sect, hugging our Prayer Book and our tradition but vacillating, timorous, one group looking longingly towards Rome, the other fighting for a Protestantism that is gone, and the *whole* Church static through fear. Let us have done I say with fear: has not God given us the "spirit of power and love and self-control"? In that spirit let us go forward to fulfill our destiny.

4. I have already indicated the profound faiths which we share as well as some of the lesser matters. It is in the interpretation of these shared possessions that we differ. That is of course a commonplace. We have bishops, we have three orders of the ministry, but we differ concerning their history and their meaning. The Anglo-Catholic considers the succession of Bishops necessary in order to assure the validity of the Sacraments. The Evangelical thinks that history has shown its importance, its ecumenical necessity, but sees too clearly the fruits of the Spirit in non-Episcopal ministries to doubt the validity or spiritual efficacy of the sacraments they administer. In other

words, some of us believe that "order" is really a part of faith; others that it is an historical development in which one must interpret the will of God as one does in all history.

But we all go on using bishops, recognizing their functions and authority (not without misgivings at times!) and never for a moment contemplating a future Church without them. And so in regard to the services in the Prayer Book and the doctrinal interpretation of them. Except for the lawless fringe on either side we all use them. We all accept the Bible as the ultimate standard of faith, but again our interpretations are varied. We all believe in the authority of the Church; but (apart from the mere technical authority of the canons of this Church and the more essential rubrics of the Prayer Book) we also believe—this is quite obvious although few of us would confess it—in the complete freedom of the individual to say where that authority begins and where it ends and what we mean by the Church which possesses it.

The discordant harmony which grows out of profound human attitudes becomes thus strikingly apparent when we turn to the various expressions of our corporate life. The situation is never simple and clear. It transcends or cuts across all "party lines." A liberal Evangelical likes an ornate Catholic ceremonial. A Catholic fundamentalist in his doctrine of the Church accepts an amazingly modern position in his conception of the historic Jesus. Now when there is no strain, no critical question or no outrageous abuse of freedom, we get along very well with our discordant harmony. When strain comes, as today, we find ourselves confused and unable to take action. We are amaz-

ingly like the Democratic Party in the 79th Congress. The cry for unity is essentially not an appeal to find a way to live together, maintaining an amiable status quo. It is an appeal to find principles of action which will enable us to move forward.

5. Three such principles seem to me of importance on what may be called the policy side. They grow out of the facts and factors in our corporate life as a Church which we have been considering.

a.—The first is that in a living growing Church controversy is not only not bad, it is good. It is necessary. In our social life no democracy can live without conflict. It is out of the adjusting of differences that we get ahead. Discordant harmony is of the essence of the liberal state. The alternative is the totalitarian. To think that unity means peace in the sense of hiding our differences and boldly shouting we are at one is only to cry "Peace, Peace," when there is no peace. If unity means no controversy we can have it at the cost of living quietly along, doing fair work in some fields and *dodging* all the fundamental questions of our faith. As I have said over and over again during these past years in relation to the unity matter: the Church has never taken a forward step without stress, without leaving many hurt, disappointed souls. That is part of life. There is, it is true, one very valid ground against controversy in the Church. It is all too often waged in bitterness, in fear, in passion. One of the constantly recurring sins of Christians is that they have not learned to differ, to debate, to confer, to seek adjustments, in the spirit of Christ. There can be unity of any kind only as we find that spirit and work in it.

b.—The second principle is that all our actions as a Church must be based upon the recognition that we do intend to include both main bodies of opinion within the Church. Unless that is clear and is generally accepted there can be no peace. I have heard men speak of converting the Church to the Catholic faith (their interpretation of it). I have heard men say that we must drive the Anglo-Catholics from the Church. Now clearly if the American Church Union or the Episcopal Evangelical Fellowship means that kind of thing our discords can never make harmony, our search for unity can end only in sectarianism. It is right that each group should believe that it sees a larger measure of truth than the other. It is wrong that this *belief* should be held other than humbly. No one of us is big enough to measure God or limit the guidance of the Holy Spirit. We all claim Christ, and so far as we can see he has accepted us all in spite of our pettinesses and ignorances and sins. There can be no unity unless we are willing to recognize each other as having a real place in the Church. Our actions as a Church must always make room for, must never exclude these substantial differences of view. It will, I hope, be realized that I do not mean by this that we must always act so that there is room for the lawless or extreme fringe on either side. Freedom and comprehensiveness in the Church do not connote anarchy.

c.—And that leads directly to one of our main difficulties; the fact that each of us is tempted again and again to proclaim our own view as the position of the Church. Now the Church does teach the great fundamentals. They are the source and goal of life. They

are the things without which our faith is vain. Those we can, we do, we must proclaim as the Church's teaching. But when I state to my people, if I am a pastor, that such and such a practice as, e.g., receiving the Communion fasting is the Church's teaching, I am in effect saying to them that those who do not accept that teaching are not really loyal to the Church. When I proclaim violently that the Prayer Book says thus and so, meaning thereby my interpretation of the Prayer Book, I am very distinctly failing to recognize one of the conditions of unity. Either those who differ with me are disloyal or I must stop asserting that my view is and must be accepted as true. That applies to Protestant-minded as well as to Catholic-minded Episcopalians. Interpretations of matters in the Prayer Book on which there is genuine difference of opinion should recognize that fact. It does not help unity when, e.g., a priest tells his people that the Church requires the use of "the sacrament of penance" meaning thereby auricular confession before communion. In this same connection it is surely right that we emphasize (and we cannot do it too strongly) with Dr. Mabry and Bishop Oldham and others the need of entire loyalty to the Prayer Book in our worship. We may have questions about the principle of uniformity. But none of us doubts that the Church does require that book and none other, together with obedience to its liturgical provisions.

6. The problem of legislation in a democratic Church which is comprehensive of such diversity in practice and thought is like that of legislation in a nation like ours. In national life there seems to be no way of avoiding the principle that the majority must rule; but



it must be recognized on the other hand that the minority has definite rights. It has a place and a real place in the total life of the nation, and the common will of the nation may not be expressed at all adequately by the majority at one special moment in the national life. Now in the Church we have the same problem. In General Convention we have assured minorities, ample, indeed too much protection. But obviously no arrangements about voting go deep enough. We can reach a fair adjustment apparently only as we accept certain principles of action. I suggest two as essential. The first is that no majority act in such a fashion as to deny to a minority the privilege of holding its own position. If all are to live in unity within the Church, no Evangelical majority has a right to enact legislation which would constitute a Church in which the Anglo-Catholic has no freedom and no place, nor an Anglo-Catholic majority in its zeal to Catholicize the Church a right to make the position of the Evangelicals untenable. There can be no unity in the face of any such efforts. The only right is the right to further the truth in Christ as we see it and by means which Christ can own. We have recognized that, for example, in the canon on divorce. No clergyman is compelled to marry a couple even if their marriage is permitted by canon. And we discovered the inexpediency and indeed uselessness of such legislation in the ritual conflicts of the 70's.

The second principle, the obverse of the first, seems to me equally important. No minority is preserving the unity of the Church unless it recognizes that when it has had due opportunity to be heard it must not obstruct action. It must not indulge in ecclesiastical fili-

bustering. There must be trust in the Christian devotion and loyalty of its opponents. There must be confidence in God and truth.

To sum up: The minority must be protected from action which is *exclusive*, for the inclusiveness of the Church is essential if we are to have unity. The majority must be protected from obstruction if we are to have both unity and action. All of which means we must have mutual trust. Of that I shall speak in a moment.

7. What I have been saying obviously leads our thinking back to the questions of the Ecumenical Movement and of specific unity projects. It is one of those projects which has made this question of our own unity a living one. No unity will be achieved without debate and controversy, and whatever is done some of us will not like it. How then are we to approach the matter in any specific case if we are to keep our own unity? We cannot approach it by evading the real issues. We have long done this. We have continued to tell the Christian world how much we want unity, and have pretty nearly always drawn back when the issue became specific. We were willing at three General Conventions in succession to declare our purpose to achieve organic unity with the Presbyterians. When it looked as if we were really getting somewhere—well—we know what happened in Philadelphia. I suppose that no one, not even among those who rejoiced because the majority proposals were defeated, thinks that our performance there was very creditable. Our action was ambiguous, confused and faltering, and it went a long way towards taking from us such leadership in the unity movement as we have had. But whether I

am right or wrong in that judgment, does not really matter; for the important point is that what happened there did not, obviously did not, help our own unity.

Now clearly we cannot avoid dealing with the problems of unity. There are too many of our people, clergy and laity, who are determined to go forward believing that only so can we fulfill God's purpose for us. Presbyterians, Methodists, Lutherans, Orthodox—on every side we have contacts. We are caught in the Ecumenical Movement and that in the good providence of God cannot stop with federation. This being so the most important factor in our own unity is to decide what we intend to do about it, to have a real policy. That does not mean the stating of terms as the convention resolution has asked the Commission to do. Such terms can become clear only as the practical issues are faced in the process of negotiations. To have a policy means precisely to decide on how we are to think of each other. And there is only one answer to that question. If we both have our place in our own Church today, both positions must be safeguarded in the Church of the future. We shall find every specific unity problem breaking our unity, making increasing discord rather than discordant harmony unless we are ready to apply to the unity problems the principles we find can alone give us internal unity. We cannot ask any Church with which we are dealing to accept as a prerequisite positions which we do not require of our own. We must give them the liberty which we possess. Our action must be inclusive and spacious, not exclusive and confined.

It is in my judgment of first impor-

tance that we should be working all the time towards organic unity, not mere inter-communion with the Orthodox Churches in America; but if the Evangelicals say to the Church we cannot unite with these people unless they accept our reformed standards, we are stalled there precisely as we are stalled with the Presbyterians when the Anglo-Catholics say we cannot unite with these people unless they accept our (the Anglo-Catholic) interpretation of the Episcopate or the sacraments or what not. There is only one way out. We must be as *big* in our dealings with the unity questions as we are in practice in our own Church. The alternative is stagnation, a complacent little body set in between the Protestant and Catholic worlds, faltering, uncertain of its own mind, and recreant to the great opportunity which God has given it to exercise the ministry of reconciliation.

8. And yet with all that I have said, the most important is still unsaid. Moral and spiritual values count more than anything else in all questions such as these. No policy, no attitude big or little can get us very far ahead unless Christian charity, that high love which is born of God who is Love, dominates all our relations with one another.

The dominance of love will show itself in at least two ways. The first is in mutual trust. Our spiritual weakness in this respect is tragic. We get along beautifully in many areas of our common life, believe in each other, think with pride of the outstanding men who hold or who in earlier generations held views opposed to ours, until some day there is an important post to be filled or a controversial question to be voted upon—then, all of a sudden, we become suspicious of one another. We talk of

the other side as playing politics. What *we* may do is obviously above suspicion; but "those Anglo-Catholics?" . . . "Those Evangelicals?" That is a true statement, is it not? I think if we search our hearts we shall find that we are all guilty. Now as a matter of fact there is nothing wrong, there is everything right in trying to fill an important post with a man in whom we believe, or to win a convention's approval of a policy which we support. Such efforts become evil only when they are not open, when they take advantage of parliamentary tricks, when they assume that God's way can be no other than that which we espouse. But we must get rid of suspicion. We must trust one another. When the going gets difficult we must remember that after all we are brothers, in one fellowship united in all the great truths which make Christianity a life-giving faith.

And the other way in which the dominance of love will show itself is that anything like schism becomes not only abhorrent but impossible. It has been one of the saddest features of these discussions of unity matters, over the last few years, that now and again the threat of schism is uttered. In the perhaps hasty word of individual leaders, in an occasional more or less official utterance, in at least one learned legal pamphlet we have heard the ominous threat. "If this or that is done the Church will be split" is the burden of the "prophet of doom."

There are three things to say about these threats. The first is that they are purely obstructionist. There has never,

so far as I know, been any proposal for unity with other Churches which in any way menaced the freedom which Anglo-Catholic and Evangelical alike already possess. Schism would I suppose be inevitable and presumably justified if it contemplated subscription on the part of the clergy to some definite Anglo-Catholic or Evangelical position. Nothing of the kind has ever been proposed. The legitimacy of those positions within the proposed United Church has never been questioned.

The second point is that unity is hardly worth fighting for if it is maintained by the threat of schism. In the last century it was the Evangelicals; it is now the Anglo-Catholics who threaten. Our present unity has, thanks to God, been kept because the great bulk of our people, clergy and laity, believe we should stick together. Unconsciously, for the most part, they see deeper than do those who threaten.

And the third point is that such threats are altogether unworthy. We are all one in Christ. We are bound together by the great Catholic verities. We pray together, receive the Holy Communion together, work for missions together, face the world together. We are one in Christ. Let us trust one another; trust the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the difficult problems which await our decision, be patient, long suffering, forbearing one another in love. We need fear then no break in our unity; for God is love and in God we cannot be divided. If we are to live and grow our unity must be "discordant," but love can make it harmony.



## AUTHORITY AND FREEDOM IN WORSHIP

By ALDEN DREW KELLEY

Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

### I

In *The Brothers Karamazov* by Dostoevsky there is set forth in the Fifth Book the most truly profound and dramatic literary expression of the mystery of Authority and Freedom. Here, in the Legend of the Grand Inquisitor, authority and freedom are seen not as abstractions nor as "ideals" but in specific and concrete persons and things. Even a casual first reading is devastating to the easy formulae of those accustomed to *thinking about* "authority" and "freedom" rather than *acting in* life situations with all their ambiguities and urgencies.

The story tells how Jesus appears in the plaza of the great cathedral in sixteenth century Seville. He is recognized and instantly becomes the center of a great throng of the common people. The Inquisitor passes by and out of fear has Jesus arrested and put in a cell. That night the Inquisitor comes to the cell alone and accuses his prisoner!

Why had Jesus come now to undo all the good the Church had accomplished through the centuries? Jesus had had his chance and failed. He might have turned stones into bread and with bread to offer all would have followed him. He might have flung himself from the pinnacle and the world would have in turn flung itself at his feet. He might have put on the power of political and military authority, then all men would have bowed down before Him. Yet He

had renounced all these things, the means and symbols of authority, because He wanted only free men, not slaves, for His companions.

But the Church is wiser. She *knows* men. They do not want this freedom because it is too hard, even impossible, for them. The Church has given men what they want and need. Perhaps in another world Jesus would be right but never in this one. He asks too much of men. It may be that a few, a very few, could stand up under the heavy burden of freedom but that is not "to save us and all men."

On and on goes the Inquisitor. Jesus answers not a word; He patiently looks at his accuser. Then at last Jesus stands, crosses over, kisses the Inquisitor and leaves, to be seen no more.

In these poor and stumbling words I paraphrase one of the classics of all time. But perhaps there can be seen here the tragic dilemma of human living on its deepest level—the relationship of the soul of man to God. It is in worship, the response of man to God, that the tension between "authority" and "freedom" appears most acutely.

Dostoevsky with characteristic insight shows us that the mystery of authority-freedom is psychological as well as theological. "The soul is an arena in which there takes place the interplay of freedom and necessity, the spiritual and the natural world" (N. Berdyaev). This is to say that our understanding of authority and freedom will depend on

our ability to see this problem on the "subjective" or existential level, the area of inner decision.

## II

The meaning of the word "authority" is best seen when used in conformity to the valuable distinction made by A. E. Taylor. Authority may be thought of as *auctoritas* (moral influence or power) as was the case with the Roman senate or as *imperium* (executive power) which was attributed to the consuls, etc. As *auctoritas*, by analogy, authority belongs only to God, His creative and redemptive activity including the Church as the Community of those who by covenant are God's people (not necessarily the Church as an empirical institution). In terms of *imperium* authority may pertain to all those who (or, to that which) in a representative capacity have executive functions within their proper and respective jurisdictions. For example, the conflict between Church and State from the Christian viewpoint is between the *imperium* of the State (the State has no *auctoritas*) and the *auctoritas* of the Church in some cases and the *imperium* of the Church in other cases.

Adherence to this distinction as much as possible will eliminate the confusion between authority and inerrancy as A. E. Taylor (to refer again to him) indicates.

Authority (*auctoritas*) in the sense of the given-ness of Reality (necessity) whether it be the universe, our business associates, our families, or ourselves may be reacted to in two ways: acceptance or rejection. It is common experience that our attitude is frequently an ambivalent one. On one hand we find our-

selves in relationships necessary to our very existence so we, usually unconsciously, are forced into acceptance. On the other hand the dynamics of self (whether good or bad) may resist the relational aspects of reality and we desire to flee from or to use them for our own purposes; both of these being a form of rejection. Most likely, because the very nature of the world and ourselves tends in those directions we either oscillate between acceptance and rejection or hold both together in tension.

Similarly, in our relation to the ultimately inescapable, *The Authority* (*auctoritas*), God Himself, our response may be positive or negative or both. Although it is not generally recognized, or at least admitted, the attitude even of Christians toward God is as ambivalent as toward the universe and its parts which are His creation. (Could it be that in some respects our reactions are even more violent because the deeper and richer the reality, the more vigorous are the responses elicited by it?)

Now, using authority as suggested above and applying it in its two senses to that area of human activity, which we call worship, certain conclusions would follow:

(A) *Authority in worship* (*auctoritas*) is that inescapable, unalterable, and objective Being who confronts us in all His Glory and Goodness. He is ontologically determinative of all worship, individual and social.

This positive response of men to God may also be seen as operating in two ways. As J. B. Pratt has pointed out, first is the self-forgetting offering, commitment, oblation response which seems to be characteristic of what is called "objective worship." Job 13: 15: "Though he slay me, yet will I trust

in him." Second is the deeply desirous yearning and striving for the Presence and Power of God and a sense of that Presence in our lives. This would be the characteristic motivation of what is called "subjective worship." St. Augustine writes, "The heart can find no rest until it rests in Thee."

These types seemingly descriptive of two quite different kinds of the worship-response represent the characteristic natures of two types of individuals or Christian groups. However, in varying degrees and differing ways, individuals and groups frequently exhibit both types of religious attitude either simultaneously or alternately.

Perhaps one more thing can be said about the character of worship. The first ("objective") type seems to correspond roughly to the free and unconditioned love termed *agape* and the second type ("subjective") is predominantly motivated by the more or less coercive value-seeking and self-fulfilling love termed *eros*. Thus we might for sake of brevity and the avoidance of certain negative prejudices associated with the words "objective" and "subjective" distinguish the two kinds of worship as "agape-worship" and "eros-worship." As Anders Nygren, one of the great contemporary Swedish theologians, has shown, Christianity down through the ages manifests both the *agape* motif and the *eros* motif, not so much as a true synthesis as in the form of an unstable compound. These two radically different, in some instances contradictory, forms of love have found theological, ethical, and devotional expression within Christianity and both will continue to do so because they are grounded in the psychological nature of man.

Christian worship is grounded in Au-

thority—the Being and Activity of God. It is man's response to the Divine initiative. God has sought us out and gives Himself to us. Pascal represents God as speaking to warn and comfort us, "*console-toi, tu ne me chercherais pas, si tu ne m'avais trouvé.*" And in the Fourth Gospel we read, "Ye have not chosen me but I have chosen you."

However, we can go further and see that the Church, in its widest sense and including the past, present, and future has some authority (*auctoritas*), at least in a relative sense. As a group, or better a Body, within which the individual's religious life is born, nurtured, and finds expression, the Church has at least some determinative power or influence. The individual may be entirely unconscious of any such organic relationship, but willy-nilly his fundamental attitude of spirit will be dependent on and informed by the religious group of which he is a part.

If the individual rebels (consciously or unconsciously) against this dependent relationship he can do so effectively only by standing on the ground already provided him by his socio-religious environment. Note that the Continental Reformers, although consciously repudiating almost everything they thought characterized the Roman Church, unconsciously (and almost inevitably) adopted some of the worst features of decadent Catholicism. Of course, this phenomenon of individual-group interdependence is not confined to religious groups. The fact is that all social relations, domestic, economic, political, or ecclesiastical involve some element of relative given-ness or authority.

(B) *Authority as imperium* is a component of worship, especially corporate worship. This is not peculiar to the so-

called liturgical churches. The worship of the "free-churches" or even the Society of Friends requires ordering or formalizing. In a small intimate group such as the family the ordering of worship may be at a minimum, especially at first. But as time goes on or as the worshipping household increases in size there is a stronger and stronger pull in the direction of "formalization." And *a fortiori* the process operates at "worship services" which include scores or hundreds.

Formalization or external ordering of services of worship leads all too often to a loss of the inner spirit of which the form is the embodiment. And the individual frustrated by this situation may turn away seeking opportunities of more personal expression. Thus he becomes involved in a cycle.

However, the ordering of corporate worship to meet the needs of as inclusive a group as possible does not inevitably result in a cycle. In the first place, the utter disappearance of the inner meaning of the forms results only from an over-preoccupation with the outer structure or from a lapse into indifference and into taking the whole thing "for granted."

In the second place, the individual's rejection of formal worship may be based on an overly subjective and ungenerous attitude which makes it difficult, if not impossible, for him to accept the discipline of participation in a group activity which does not fully and precisely reflect his own desires or needs. Although all of life demands from us such self-limitations there are apparently some who are so hyper-sensitive, so far as religion goes, that they feel they must detach themselves from others to approach God properly. They are inclined

to think of themselves as extremely "spiritual" or "cultivated" or something of that sort—a religious *élite*. Lawrence Hyde in his *Prospects of Humanism* speaks a corrective word to such: "I suggest that the modern cultivated person is *over-estimating* his power of maintaining contact with the realm of the spiritual in his present condition. . . . He imagines in his self-sufficiency that he can get along satisfactorily without rites and ceremonies, without private disciplines, without associating himself on a religious basis with a group of his fellowmen. But the plain fact is that he cannot—unless he is a very exceptional person indeed. The great mass of more highly educated men and women today—those anyway of a more spiritual type—are psychologically unstable, restless, unfulfilled, and morbidly self-conscious."

In the third place, it should be noted that within those churches which are regarded as the most liturgical there exists a proportionately larger number of individuals whose personal religious life is deep and rich. As both A. E. Taylor and Evelyn Underhill have reminded us, the great mystics in Christianity were for the most part people whose lives have been nourished within the tradition of liturgical worship. With this view Douglas Steere, who is a member of the Friends, in his little book *Prayer and Worship* seems to agree when he points out that "private prayer" needs corporate worship to grow. "The regular participation in corporate worship nurtures the tender insight of private prayer and helps to give it a stalk, a stem, a root and soil in which to grow. Without its strengthening power of believing in your conviction, you may be overcome by the

general attitude of the world in which you live. . . ."

### III

If space permitted it would be helpful to try to arrive at some clarification of thought as to the use of the word "freedom." However, all that can be said here is perhaps best summarized by N. Berdyaev's words. "Freedom is the freedom of the spirit (unconstrained by the outward and the objective, where what is deep and inward determines all) and it is mere illusion to search for it exclusively in the natural world. For the order of freedom and the order of nature are opposed one to another. . . . Nature is always a deterministic system, and our own nature therefore cannot be the source of our freedom. . . . It is quite as difficult to find liberty as [it is to find] immortality within the human soul or within the world of nature. Freedom must be discovered and revealed in the experience of the spiritual life, for it is impossible to demonstrate it or deduce its existence from the nature of things." Or, in another place Berdyaev says, "Freedom is self determination in the inmost depths of being and is opposed to every kind of external determination which constitutes a compulsion in itself."

These statements bring us close to Hegel's definition, "Freedom is to be in possession of oneself."

This means that apart from Christianity there is no freedom, and determinism is always supreme. "Freedom of spirit, like immortality, is not natural to man; it is rather a new birth in which the spiritual man makes his appearance, and which is only revealed in the experience of the spiritual life." To be

free is to have entered upon another order of being.

Perhaps it should be said in passing that the mystery of freedom is not to be confused with the problem of free-will. As has been well shown by Berdyaev they have no connection, historical or metaphysical, and whenever they have been regarded as in any way similar or equivalent there has resulted ethical and theological nonsense.

Having said this much in order to put the Christian view of freedom within its proper setting and perspective, it should be pointed out that in a sense "authority" is secondary to "freedom"; that is from the viewpoint of religious experience. The "sense" in which authority is secondary is in the *psychological* rather than *theological* sense. Metaphysically and historically authority is prior to freedom but on the existential level of man's relation to God, it is always subordinate to freedom. "Authority" presupposes faith and freedom for its *acceptance*, in the sense of *auctoritas*, and for its *existence*, in the sense of *imperium*. If we do not believe in Popes or Councils or Scriptures or Church, and if we do not recognize in them spiritual realities, then they possess no sort of authority over us. There are no outward demonstrations of truth provided by "authorities" which are unshakeable and coercive in character and which permit escape from the burden of freedom.

This view of the secondary and derived character of "authority" has direct bearing on the place of freedom in worship. First, for worship to be anything more than the yielding or submission of the soul to God in the same manner that it passively accepts the necessity or given-ness of the material world there must be an active inner freedom.



There must be freedom in love—freedom of the spirit. The human soul cannot be something acted upon, pushed around, moved extrinsically like a thing. It must have the inner capacity for response; and that means freedom. God demands free response—none other is acceptable to Him. Of course this presupposes that the image of God in the human soul has not been entirely obliterated and that there is existent within us at least some trace of an “initial freedom” (original freedom which is a means” to such ends as Beauty, Truth, Goodness—God).

In the second place, what may be called *final* freedom (“the glorious liberty of the sons of God”) goes beyond the need of the supporting structure of ordered and formal worship. This freedom is not achieved by rejection of worship in its formal types; but by growing up through it, it may move on to a quite personal and spontaneous level of religious expression. Such worship can never become *private* or wholly individual because all worship, from the Christian viewpoint, is that of a member of the Body. (It might help in the thought and practice of worship if we gave up entirely the use of the phrase “private prayer.”)

“Freedom” in worship in the above sense is the privilege only of a very few in this world—the mystics and others of the spiritual aristocracy. Let us be realistic and admit that for most of us it is an aspiration and not an achievement, although in varying degrees we may be successful in taking the first few halting steps toward affective or contemplative prayer and meditation. Which is to say that the development of the life of the spirit through worship is for most by means of the ordered and formalized

services of corporate worship *and* the personal or free expressions of the inner life. There is a polarity in worship which is both natural and desirable.

If worship becomes *merely* conventional and formalized (it rarely does) the vine of the spiritual life is blighted by drought or frost. On the other hand if the free movement of the spirit is completely formless and inchoate (it rarely is) the rank growth is barren of fruit. There is a dialectic here which finds its practical resolution only by “freedom in Christ” and in His Body, the Church.

The tension in worship between “form” (authority) and “spirit” (freedom) is a reflection of a wider conflict between the protagonists of rational meaning or “*significant form*” and the enthusiasts for *vitality*. In literature the controversy rages around *style* versus *strength*; in the arts the disagreement is between various *conventional forms* and *primitivism*; and in philosophy it is the dispute between the *rationalists* or intellectualists and the *vitalists* or romanticists.

That the tension is exceptionally acute in worship can be realized when we appreciate the depth and emotional intensity of that experience which lifts the members of the worshipping community out of themselves and fills them with a sense of the immediate presence of God. I quote from *The Faith of a Moralist* by A. E. Taylor where we find well-expressed the fundamental tension: “I need not particularize to make it obvious why importance should be attached to the fostering of the true temper of worship. By devices which aim at shutting out both the commonplace and the unworthy, and so erecting an environment which makes it easier to maintain

in the worshipping assembly the right, not a wrong, mood of unworldliness. No doubt, if we could make the soul entirely independent of 'environment,' we should have no need of these devices, but if we could do that we should have ceased to be what, in fact, we are, and must remain, 'creatures.' It is part of the humility of the 'creature' to recognize that there is for it no absolute escape from 'environment.' This, as it seems to me, explains and largely justifies the tendency of all worships to take on a traditionally conventionalized form.

"On the other side, there is no attitude in life which is so intensely *personal* as the attitude of the worshipper in the felt presence of his God. Unless adoration has occupied the inmost citadel of my personality, I am not really worshipping; I am merely complying with an external form. Religion is not, as the quietist holds it to be, merely a personal affair between myself and my Maker, but it is at least that, however much more it may be; when the intimate personal relation is absent nothing can replace it. . . . Now there is always sure to be much in the conventional *cultus* of my group which does not stand in any felt relation to my own personality, much which to me individually is a matter of mere form imposed from outside, and perhaps felt to be more or less repugnant. We can understand, therefore, why in this department of life, more than in any other, the institutional and conventional should provoke the individual's resentment."

In the "sects" as distinguished from, or outside of, the Church and the "sects" within the Church (monastic communities) may be seen the tendency to reject everything which seemingly

conflicts with evangelical ardor and simplicity and which demands the utmost personal consecration, the costly conversion of the whole life to God and His purpose, and the restoration to its original position of importance the charismatic and prophetic character of primitive Christianity. Thus the "sect" complements the "Church" in worship as well as in other ways.

Evelyn Underhill in *Worship* reminds us, "Indeed they (sect and church) are the completing opposites of that total Godward life which it (the Gospel) reveals; and it is only the constant re-assertion, both inside and outside its borders, of that vigorous spiritual realism from which Sects are born, which saves the worship of the Church from crystallizing tendencies inherent in all formal religion. In their extreme form, however, Sect and Church represent distinct and even incompatible conceptions of the life of worship; the one giving priority to corporate tradition and authority; the other to personal enthusiasm and experience."

#### IV

In the early Church, even in New Testament times, there appear those elements in worship which are characteristic of both "authority" and "freedom." Probably the casual reader of the New Testament is most aware of the primitive church as the "*little flock*," the family, the sect within Judaism. He sees vividly the spontaneity and uncalculated nature of those meetings typified by edification (the long, long sermons) and charismatic worship—e.g., the speaking with tongues, the impromptu and free prayers. Even though he may feel with St. Paul that everything said



and done was not an unmixed blessing, truly there were evidences of the Spirit.

What is not so directly and strikingly evident is that these more or less "informal" meetings are not to be regarded as any more typical of the period than are the solemn gatherings together for the Breaking of Bread (the Eucharist) or for the proclamation of God's Word (the Synaxis). The former, coming directly from a Jewish ceremonial meal, and the latter patterned naturally after the familiar synagogue worship were both "ceremonious" occasions. They were not "free" nor "simple."

Dom Gregory Dix has pointed out that the association of "Puritanism" with "Protestantism" (as a theological viewpoint) is an historical accident and not at all necessary nor inevitable. Puritanism seems to imply that worship is a purely mental activity, to be exercised by a strictly psychological attention to a subjective emotional or spiritual experience. Anything external which might impair this or be a distraction has no rightful place in worship. The defect and danger of the puritan view of worship is that it has a tendency to "verbalism" and supposes that words alone can express or stimulate the experience of worship. It ignores the whole man and forgets that *action* is as much a part of experience as words. In any case, "puritanism" as an ascetic attitude in morals and worship is not typical of the primitive church as a whole although "puritanism," itself rooted in Judaism, developed along with and within the Christian community.

Not only would the tradition of Jewish worship tend to bring about the ordered forms of worship but as time passed the inner drive of the early Christian group toward a "church" life

rather than a "sect" life would result in greater formalization and increase of emphasis on ordinances and sacraments in the services. This does not mean that there was much in the way of standardization or uniformity of rite or ceremonial. It should be remembered that although the fundamental structure of the services was fairly well established there was the greatest variety of outward form (verbal and ceremonial) from city to city and from "officiant" to "officiant."

In fact from the earliest times up to the Reformation in the west, it was not thought particularly important nor, apparently, desirable, that there should be uniformity of rite. It is interesting to note that while the Eastern church (or churches) always feared theological heterodoxy—hence the partiality for the word *Orthodox*; the Church of the West prior to the Reformation regarded schism as the great sin—hence the emphasis on "*Catholic*." Moreover there was permitted relative freedom not only of theological discussion but also of liturgical practice in Western Catholicism before the 16th Century. Accordingly, it would seem then that the present day insistence on uniformity in worship, by some parts of the Anglican Communion, as a means of unity is not completely verified by history.

As has been suggested above there was within the Church a parallel development of the "informal" and personal devotional life of members of the Christian Community. This is seen in part as a result of the growth of the extraliturgical worship of monasticism. Beginning with the hermit monks who first tried to live up to the call of God for the dedication of the *whole* of life and their recitation of the psalter, with intensely

personal prayer and meditation, the Divine Offices gradually developed out of the communities of "religious." Here again we find the familiar pattern of increasing formalization and authority as the once *individual* devotions become socialized and an expression of corporate life.

It was the growth of monasticism with its highly ascetic (or "puritanical") life of worship which made possible the absorption of thousands into the Church and its worship, in the Constantinian era, without the degradation of the Liturgy into an official imperial cult. In *The Shape of the Liturgy* by Gregory Dix the foregoing point is clearly made: "Every year some hundreds of thousands of members of ordinary Christian congregations were leaving the world to give themselves—their life and being—to nothing else but *worship*, so far as this might be possible for mortal man. The whole church could not but be familiarized thus with the idea that worship is not only the highest among activities (the pre-Nicene church had been well aware of that) but can become an expression of his *whole* being, towards which every other activity can be directed. . . . In the pre-Nicene church faith and worship could and did irradiate the whole life of the believer; but just because ordinary secular life was organized on a pagan basis, worship and life were two opposed things. . . . The church at large, just because she was in the world, could not renounce all secular life as the monk did, but she learned from him to sanctify it."

The monastic ideal, which is the expression of the sect within the Church, has played its necessary part in maintaining within the Church's corporate life the witness to and the tradition of

free, personal, and relatively less formalized worship as well as a concern for the cultivation of the interior life. Because the monastic communities and religious orders have lived *within* rather than *outside* the Church there has been always a counterbalance for extreme individualism and subjectivism by reason of the larger environment with its complementary demands for participation in the whole life of the Church as expressed through its liturgical and formal worship. The tension thus maintained has been a fruitful one.

## V

This discussion of authority and freedom in worship cannot be regarded as exhaustive or even adequate. It has been the modest purpose of the writer to raise certain questions with the hope that further study and thought by the reader may lead the latter to see more clearly the fundamental issues. In doing this the writer has tried to underline some aspects of the "mystery."

The main points to be considered are as follows: (1) Authority and freedom and the relation between the two are deep mysteries having their origin within the abyss of the human soul and the effort of man to live in this particular universe. (2) Authority as a word refers to two quite different realities, i.e., moral influence or power (auctoritas) and external coercive power (imperium). (3) Authority in both senses is inevitably to be found in worship because in all human living authority enters into the relationship of the individual to his environment, domestic, social, biological, physical. (4) At the same time freedom is essential in the response of the individual in worship, as in all living, if he is to be human and

not a sub-personal thing. (5) In worship the tension between authority and freedom is most acute because in worship is involved not merely the relationship of man to his immediate environment but also to the Ultimate Reality of the total continuum-process. This Ultimate is a Being who is the source of all authority and of all freedom. (6) There has been for both historical and psychological reasons a tendency in religion (including the Christian religion) to resolve the tension by ignoring one element, i.e., either by the emphasizing of the given, the corporate, and the formal element in worship to the exclusion of the free, personal, and interior elements *or vice versa*. (7) The history of Christian worship as well as our knowledge of the psychology of religion combine to show that separation of the authority-freedom complex is false, frustrating, and ultimately a failure. Authority-freedom in worship as in the whole of life is a unitary process within total reality. (8) Within the central stream of ongoing and full Christianity one sees that authority *and* freedom, or "authority-freedom," in worship has been maintained with utmost fruitfulness.

In the words of A. G. Hebert, *Liturgy and Society*, "The sum of the matter is this: The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. Evangelicalism has been

afraid of the letter, and has desired to live by the spirit. But the spirit does not work *in vacuo*: it takes the letter, and gives life to the letter. The spirit needs forms in which to work: apart from those forms, it finds nothing on which to get a grip. Therefore Evangelicals also find that what is precious to them is after all enshrined in forms whose use is so easily perverted into formalism: forms of prayer, sacraments, The Visible Church. Ecclesiastical and liturgical forms are the safeguards of the authentic Christian experience which Evangelicalism treasures."

#### Book List

- N. Berdyaev, *Freedom and The Spirit*.
- A. G. Hebert, *Liturgy and Society*.
- W. James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*.
- J. B. Pratt, *The Religious Consciousness*.
- O. C. Quick, *The Christian Sacraments*.
- W. L. Sperry, *Reality in Worship*.
- D. V. Steere, *Prayer and Worship*.
- E. Underhill, *Worship*.

#### Questions

1. Why is authority inescapable in life?
2. Why is freedom essential in life? Is freedom possible?
3. In the *Legend of the Grand Inquisitor*, who is right? Why?
4. Wherein does authority appear in worship?
5. Wherein does freedom appear in worship?
6. Which religious groups in history tend most toward authority in worship? Which most emphasize freedom? Which best maintain both authority *and* freedom?

## HOOKER'S DOCTRINE OF GOD

By JOHN S. MARSHALL

University of the South

Hooker's master-work, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, is not a systematic theology, neither is it a theological philosophy, nor a manual of doctrine; it is an exposition of the meaning of law in the organic whole of reality and in the life of individuals and nations, and the application of this world-view to the significance of both Church and State. The general notion of law and its place in the various levels of reality are the foundation of his application of law to national and ecclesiastical organization. The total result is one of the most brilliant expositions of the character of Christianity to be found in the whole history of thought, a system of unique comprehensiveness of design and fulness of interpretation, an organic scheme of both theology and philosophy, a Renaissance literary whole that grasps rich detail within the mosaic complexity of its extensive patterns.

Despite this wide comprehensiveness, there are theological conceptions that are not defined, and aspects of Christian thought that are implied rather than clarified. This is particularly true of the doctrine of God: it has a central place in Hooker's thought, but the notion of God and of His character is only suggested and never elaborated in the pages of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*. Hooker, with the wisdom of a great writer, keeps before him the problem to which he has set his hand, and elaborates no conception that is unnecessary for its clarification. The general character of law and its relevance for the understanding of Church and State

keep the center of his attention, and thus there is a directness of approach in his writing that makes of the *Polity* a great work of literature as well as of philosophy and theology, for Hooker understands the need of simplicity and coherence in the exposition of an idea. He is not a scholastic expounding his theology, he is not a pedagogue lecturing to a class, he is a great man of literature who marshals his evidence in such a way as to produce a work of literary excellence and artistic beauty.

Hooker uses the most diverse sources for his doctrines, and yet gives to his work a unity and a coherence that are authentic and real. That is because he sees the relevant facts indicated by each author he uses, and in the light of these facts interprets the history of the past and brings out the general character of all the facts given him by other authors, and relates them within the mosaic pattern of a highly complex and comprehensive reality. Hooker is an essentially Renaissance thinker who seeks the meaning of the new age in Patristic and Mediaeval theologians, in Ancient and Mediaeval philosophy, in the Bible and in Modern literature, in the Early Church, the Mediaeval Church, the Modern Church. He seeks meaning in the history and the philosophy of each age of the western world, and all of these insights, particularly those drawn from the Bible and the history of the Church, illuminate each modern problem and make it significant for us.

Hooker's method is comprehensive because he believes we cannot divine

what lies in the unique revelation of God in the Bible unless we use many sources of knowledge, many aids to our thought. Because the Bible furnishes us with the supreme revelation of reality, every fact we know about the actual world helps us to understand the meaning of the Christian revelation. The uniqueness of Christianity lies in its disclosure of the meaning of actuality, not in its distinction from truth and real existence.

1. *Hooker's Conception of Law.*—The fundamental conception of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* is the notion of law and its place in the universe. Law is for Hooker the basis of the whole system of civil and ecclesiastical order, for it is the bulwark against caprice, the fortress against which anarchy in the state and scepticism in morals and religion cannot prevail. It is the very foundation, the bed rock of our faith, our hope, our love. For "of law there can be no less acknowledged, than that her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the Harmony of the world: all things in heaven and earth do her homage, the very least as feeling her care, and the greatest as not exempt from her power, both Angels and men and the creatures of what condition soever, though each in different sort and manner, yet all with uniform consent, admiring her as the mother of their peace and joy."<sup>1</sup>

What Hooker seeks in the *Ecclesiastical Polity* is a philosophy of law, a philosophy that will bring every feature of reality within the scope of order, and reveal uniformity in all things from

God down to a grain of sand. This outline of philosophy Hooker found in a Neo-Platonic phase of the system of St. Thomas Aquinas. St. Thomas has a hierarchical notion of reality, a conception of the universe as an existence on many levels, levels reaching from inorganic matter up to God as the Supreme Being and the Source of all other being. Each level has a law of its own being, the law that gives it its character and nature. This theory came to St. Thomas from Proclus and Dionysius the Areopagite, and is just the part of the Thomistic system that Hooker takes as the clue to his whole system of reality. Hooker makes of this one Platonic conception something of fresh simplicity and beauty. The simplicity is that of the general outlines of the philosophy of Dionysius, and the beauty that of the Neo-Platonic philosophy latent in St. Thomas' idea of the law both human and divine.

The simplicity and beauty of Hooker are lacking in St. Thomas because of the intricacy of the deductive scheme which he uses and because of the complexity of the linear scheme of syllogisms. The Neo-Platonic scheme of levels and the Thomistic conception of the laws of the levels of reality furnish Hooker with a philosophy of law applicable to the new age. There is in Hooker's theory of law a grand simplicity lacking in Thomas, for Hooker's philosophy has a clarity of configuration and a nobility of architectonic that are the fruit of the Renaissance rather than the mediaeval mind. It has a complexity of its own, but it is a complexity like unto a literary work rather than that of a system of sorites.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, in *Works*, arranged by John Keble, 7th ed. revised by Dean Church and Bishop Paget, I. xvi. 8.

<sup>2</sup> E. G. Selwyn, *The First Book of the Irenicum of John Forbes of Corse*, p. 189. John Forbes "is—what Hooker and Jeremy Taylor



for Hooker's is a Renaissance system of thought.

It is the conception of Hierarchical law that gives meaning to the whole order of physical reality, as Hooker knows it, to the whole organization of civil and ecclesiastical society, built up as they are on human nature and human legislation. He also sees the pages of the Bible as a revelation of the meaning of human experience in terms of the law and order. The speculative phase is simple and yet one of the most significant in all human philosophy, and is a conception that is implied in Holy Scripture as well: it is the notion that there is an eternal law of God's own nature, and that there is an eternal law of all created things. The eternal law of God's own Nature is called "the first eternal law," and the law for all created things is called "the second eternal law."<sup>3</sup> Hooker terms the law of nature "second" because it is the law of that which in the scheme of reality lies below the Ultimate, the First Being in the series; it lies below God in the hierarchy of existence. There is a variety, a diversity, in the second eternal law because of the difference of kind between angels, men, and physical objects.

Hooker also has a place within his scheme for positive law or the law of Commandment and legislation,<sup>4</sup> for although positive law throws less light on the hierarchy of reality, legislation does have a place in the living social life of man, and in God's relationship to man. Thus God is a Being whose nature is that of an Eternal Law and whose character

is that of a Legislator, one who commands and is to be obeyed. Our God is the source of the second eternal law and also of the divine positive law, for God is both the eternal and the temporal Lord of Heaven and Earth.

Thus we have in Hooker a unitary view in which law is the primary principle of the explanation of the whole of reality from God down to the most lowly physical object. Hooker sees law as the ground of all character, all significance, all intelligibility, for all intrinsic meaning rests on law, and law is that which is meaningful in itself. Law is the pattern which binds together the mosaic of elements which make up the total whole of reality, and for Hooker it is the key to the understanding of the universe, and without it even life in the Godhead would be chaotic and confused.<sup>5</sup> However, the order and law of God's Nature are not impersonal and lacking in volitional power. God is the God of law and order, but unlike the God of Aristotle, Plotinus, and Proclus He is also a Ruler, and a Commander of the Hosts of Heaven and Earth; He is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. To be sure He is the God of law—that Hooker learned from the Greeks as well as his Bible—but God is not an *actus purus*, because He is the God of history, the God of battles, the Being of Love and Power who redeems history and makes out of the tragedies of earth's failures the beauty of the anthems of Creation's heavenly chorus.

2. *God as Personal.*—Hooker's mind is shaped by biblical and literary analogies rather than by syllogistic arguments. He did, it is true, inherit the

were not—a scholastic." John Forbes as an Anglican scholastic reveals the difference between the new method of Hooker and the older method inherited from St. Thomas.

<sup>3</sup> *Ecc. Pol.*, I. iii. 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, I. xv. 1.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, I. ii. 3 ff.

Greek conceptions of order, and the mediaeval notion of law; but both Greek and mediaeval schemes are illuminated by the light from the Scriptures and the radiance of literary and historical knowledge. Hooker's God is the God of all history, the God of the living world of men, and the God of the living Bible. For this reason Hooker does not accept the Thomistic doctrine of final causes, for it differs from the biblical conception of history and from the facts of all true history. As Hooker reads his Bible he finds that God and man work together, and because of human free-will and the evil that follows the misuse of free-will, the pattern is not that of simple final causes and their distortion, but rather is the result of the Divine Providence weaving out of the material of human successes and failures a pattern that is redemptive in meaning, a sublime but tragic drama of the work of human salvation. It is the story of the Cross and the story of the Resurrection, it is the story of the failure of man yet the coming of the Kingdom of God. There is a conception of final causes implied in Hooker, but it is different from the notion of St. Thomas in its recognition of the tentative character of our knowledge of these causes and the complexity of their relationship to the Divine Purpose.<sup>6</sup> The fundamental facts are very intricate but may be simply expressed in the biblical portrayal of man both foolishly and deliberately erring from the ways of God in a world of much distortion and much positive evil. It is a

<sup>6</sup> Thomas Case, *Realism in Morals*, Part 2, "Final Causes," pp. 9 ff. Case points out that final causes are not obvious in life and require scientific determination to be understood, whereas final cause as the Divine Providence is all but inscrutable.

world of order that has been blighted and cursed by evil, and yet is being redeemed by the Divine work of God Himself. The Christian believes that there are hints of the Divine Purpose, the Final Cause of God, but that purpose is not wholly clear and only emerges with radiance in the Incarnation and its influence on human history. The ultimate meaning of history is in the hands of God, and the final meaning of corporate human life is His not ours: our times are in His hands.

Such is the living God of the Old and New Testaments: One who is personal, and because personal chooses, plans, and directs, for "the Father by the Son both did create, and doth guide all," and "doth work as Lord and king over all. . . ."<sup>7</sup> He is a personal God, revealed supremely in the kingship of the Mediator, Jesus Christ. God as revealed in Incarnate Deity, as the divine power through which the Son of God "doth work as king and lord upon us which are on earth,"<sup>8</sup> is the great strategist, the warrior who leads his forces from victory to victory. He is the captain of the hosts and through His conquests He saves us, and He saves us by His Providence and guidance.<sup>9</sup> His ways are past our finding but we are dimly aware of His guidance in the history of mankind.

Hooker stresses the relationship of God to the world and pleads an ignorance about the absolute phases of God's nature. He does not even understand the divine plan for mankind, he knows neither the day nor the hour. Hence, he surrenders any attempt to use the scholastic or deductive method in his discus-

<sup>7</sup> *Ecc. Pol.*, VIII. iv. 6.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, VIII. iv. 6.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, VIII. iv. 6.



sions about God and His relations to us. He does not begin with definitions about God's nature and from these deduce the concepts that express the character of God and His purposes for the world. What Hooker undertakes is much more tentative and experimental: he takes the Bible as a historical account of God's dealings with the world, and he takes such clues as he thinks he has of God's influence in the history of the Church and of Nations, and from these sources attempts to gain some clue to the working of God in creation and in the history of all mankind. It is a tentative method, but fruitful; and has many similarities to the conception of history formulated in our own day by Alfred North Whitehead. He reveals to us God as the redeemer and Saviour of mankind, One who works with man and saves us from the evil of our own undoing, for without Him we are lost, and with Him even our defeats may be turned into victory.

It is the Incarnation that makes such a conception as Hooker's possible, and without the theology of the Incarnation the method fails, for in the Incarnation we find the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, "Who for us men and our salvation came down from heaven . . . and was made man." Hooker is interested in the revelation of God in history, and the clue to this manifestation is the Incarnation as an Epiphany, as "a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel." It is the Incarnation and the Mediatorship of Jesus Christ that give us the conception of God as redeeming the world through His Son, and of God united with our nature in the continual high priestly mediation of our Saviour.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, V, lv. 8.

3. *The Character of God.*—Hooker is not agnostic about God's character, but his knowledge is gained from Holy Scripture and general history. From nature we learn that there is a God, but not what He is, it is from the Bible that we learn of His character as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. As the Scriptures lead on from step to step to the supreme revelation in our Lord, we realize the character of God Himself as manifest to us in His Son, "the brightness of his glory and the express image of his person." The various absolute characteristics of God do not interest Hooker as much as do the traits of the Divine Character, the Love, the Justice, and the Sympathy of God, the Tenderness, Mercy, and Wrath of God, the Foreknowledge and the Providence of God. His theology most naturally finds its focal center in the incarnate and mediatorial revelation of the ascended Christ, because he believes that in Jesus Christ there is to be found the express image of the person of Deity Himself. It is in our Lord Jesus Christ that we find the clue to the character of God and His relationship to the world.<sup>11</sup> Incarnate Deity is a fact both of history and of eternity, and it is the supreme manifestation of God's character.

God's very personal character as revealed in the Incarnation forces special problems upon the attention of the critical Christian theologian. In the *Ecclesiastical Polity* Hooker treats of them only in a manner relevant to the problem before him, the law of Church and State, but the general tenor of the conceptions is clear enough to the thoughtful reader: it is the tradition of the Greek Fathers and St. Augustine, a the-

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, VIII. iv. 6.

ology whose center is the Incarnation. A personal Deity whose life is related to the world through the Incarnation and the Mediatorship of the God-Man is a Being of such complexity and intricacy that the task of understanding Him makes the logician hesitate.<sup>12</sup> And a hesitation is to be found in Hooker, particularly in his answer to *The Christian Letter*, where in his struggle with the Calvinistic logic he finds difficulty in bringing together all the strands of thought found in the biblical revelation of God.<sup>13</sup> Perhaps he is too much impressed by Calvin's logic, as F. D. Maurice thinks,<sup>14</sup> but in any case he attempts to hold to just those aspects of Incarnate Deity which the Puritans forgot, and thus forces us to realize the majestic wonder of the greatness of God.

For Hooker God is first and foremost a moral Being; His very nature is goodness.<sup>15</sup> He wills goodness and delights in it, for "that which he willeteth determinately of his own accord, is not only to himself always good, but in such sort good that he chooseth it, maketh it his end, taking pleasure and delight in it, as being utterly without hurt."<sup>16</sup> Hooker refuses to accept the Calvinistic doctrine of damnation of sinners for the greater glory of God, the theory that good is good simply because God wills it. God does not will and does not desire sin, but it comes from the free-will of man. Of course, God does make good out of man's evil and so "He turneth to good that which was never by Himself intended nor desired"; but He does not

desire and He does not will the evil that man does.<sup>17</sup> "The evil of sin is within the compass of God's prescience, but not of his predestination, or fore-ordaining will."<sup>18</sup> Hooker recognizes that there is a kind of harm in the world that God cannot overcome, even though good comes from things evil through the Divine overruling. The loss of a soul is a real loss, even though a good may be wrought out of the catastrophe, for Hell is a tragedy in the Divine economy.<sup>19</sup>

Such a God is a Deity of Love and Mercy, but also a God of Wrath and Justice. The Goodness of God cannot be understood without His Justice in the ordering of the world. His redemptive work is the saving of the world from that sin which He so much dislikes. God is not only a God of will but a God of desires, and He hates sin just because He loves the goodness of the world He has created.<sup>20</sup> The God revealed in the Incarnation is both Redeemer and Judge, the One who condemns because He loves the world of righteousness.

So on every page Hooker points to God as a moral character, but one whose nature we do not fully understand, yet whose nature could be understood if we did but grasp things ultimate. However, we can sense the character of God, His moral being, without an adequate intellectual formulation of that character. How God foreknows, Hooker never successfully explains, and yet despite such halting theory he remains true to what he considers biblical doctrines. How the divine wrath combines with the divine love he cannot explain, and yet

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, I. ii. 2.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix to Bk. V, No. 1.

<sup>14</sup> F. D. Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, new ed., vol. II, p. 191.

<sup>15</sup> *Eccl. Pol.*, I. xi. 2.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix to Bk. V, No. 1, 26.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix to Bk. V, No. 1, 26.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix to Bk. V, No. 1, 32.

<sup>19</sup> The case of Judas is discussed by Hooker. Appendix to Bk. V, No. 1, 26.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix to Bk. V, No. 1, 32.

the Incarnate Deity reveals such a combination in the very character of the Godhead. Fundamentally Hooker was a theologian whose philosophy found its center in the Incarnation and whose Deity was a God of Love, but he also held that God had foreknowledge and that he was a God of Justice and Wrath.

In all this, his doctrines are like those of the Greek Fathers, who consider God's character is lost in mystery and is past finding out. In Hooker we are ultimately faced with the enigma of God's Being, a character whose full nature is partially hidden from our grasp; and yet we know He is the Father of lights, whose rays lighten our darkness and illuminate all upon which His light falls. According to Hooker the unaided intellect only grasps one aspect of the Divine Nature, and that is the unity of Deity, but the Bible reveals to us a God of such richness and complexity of Life that it quite transcends our feeble minds to find Him out.

4. *Hooker and Modern Theology.*—Hooker's is a method of comprehensiveness, but a comprehensiveness without compromise, without eclecticism, without the destruction of the true values of the Christian heritage. Because he permits the light from the new literature, from the new experiments in government, from the writings of the ancients, and from the tomes of the scholastics to make clear the words of the Scriptures, because he allows the light from the Incarnation to illuminate all lesser knowledge, the result is the revelation of a world of law, the law of nature, and the law of God's own Being. Here we have the best of the Anglican method, a method that remains loyal to the traditions of the Christian heritage by the manifesta-

tion of their significance for the whole domain of civilization and by the disclosure that the light is not quenched if it illuminates, but only shows forth its character the more clearly as light.

The strength of Hooker lies in the method he uses, in the philosophical use of his Bible: the clue to his procedure is to be found in the fact that it is biblical in material and philosophical in technique. He grasps the presuppositions of the biblical accounts and uses them as the key to unlock the revelation of the nature of God as exhibited in His manifestations in nature and human history. God is disclosed and yet partially hidden from our sight; "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son which is the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." The light we have is enough to lighten our darkness and guide us on our way, but it does not make clear every mystery of the Divine Nature, and does not explain every phase of a complete metaphysics.

The value of this method is that it escapes the many perils of the usual use of the Bible in theology. Much of the value of the new emphasis on the Holy Scriptures in the Reformation was lost when the Bible was made into a manual of theology, a textbook of axioms and postulates about God's nature. Hooker used his Bible in another way: he treated it as a record, as a narrative of God's gradual revelation of Himself at sundry times and in divers manners. The Incarnation is the key to all else, and the Law and the Prophets lead us on to the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. It is clear that this is Hooker's method, but he apparently is not completely conscious of the technique he is employing, and hence is at a loss to use it when he

must deal with the dialectic of the Calvinists.

When Hooker uses this method of interpretation of his Bible he finds God revealed there as a Deity of law and order, and the same conception is implied in the analysis of nature. In our day Whitehead has developed a conception of the function of God in the order of the universe that has many features that remind us of Hooker, for Hooker touched that point of greatest sensitivity in modern scientific thought, the problem of order in the cosmos. The Anglican has seldom conceived of God in terms of arbitrary will or capricious government of the universe, he has always sought to find the revelation of Deity in order and in justice. In this respect Hooker in the sixteenth century and Whitehead in the twentieth are both representative Anglicans. The same stress on order can also be found in F. D. Maurice and Archbishop William Temple.

Hooker also joins with recent theology in his treatment of God as in some respects personal. An extreme stress on personality takes the form of Deism or Unitarianism, but Hooker escapes this difficulty by the recognition that human analogies are only partially adequate to the description of God's Being. God is personal, but He is more than a person, as is manifest in the Triune character of His Nature, for He can never fully be grasped by any human analogy and the mystery of His being outstrips all our knowledge. Our analogies help us, but do not ultimately define Him, for God is the Ultimate and the things of earth are not. We are wise if we are true to the tradition of Hooker and recognize God as the Ultimate, the Creator of heaven and earth. Hence He must be

accepted as the Ground of all else, One who explains rather than is explained by other things.

The revelation of God as the God of law and order has been coordinated by Hooker with that of the nature of God as personal. The tremendous stress on law, and the recognition that God's Being transcends any earthly analogy, have kept the Anglican from thinking of God as simply a person. God is personal, but He is more than a person, He is rather a "Trinity personal," a Being far more complex than a personality, for He is God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The richness of His character is not fully grasped by the analogy of human personality, since the Trinity is a revelation of that mystery of the Divine Being that outreaches our knowledge and yet helps us to see all else clearly, both the things of earth and the things of heaven.

Our analogies do help us, but they do not ultimately define God for us, since the nature of man is not ultimate, whereas the Being of God is. Here we are wise if we remain in the tradition of Hooker, for he perceives that the Ultimate is "the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named," a personal Being who illuminates for us the meaning of the life of all persons on earth rather than they Him. Thus knowledge and experience must grow just because we are derivative and He is Ultimate.

Hooker forces us to recognize the relevance of law and order to a Christian philosophy and to a Christian theology; he calls our attention to the importance of the revelation of the personal character of the Being of God; he makes us realize the fulness of the biblical manifestation of God redeeming the world

to Himself through Incarnation; he brings us face to face with the wonder and the glory of the visions of St. Paul and St. John, who saw the vast vista of history finding its character and its consummation in the mediatorial work of

Jesus Christ. Hooker saves us from a facile and over-simple notion of God, and that is well, for our greatest need in the domain of theology is a conception of God adequate to nature, to history, to the Incarnation.

## THE ANTECEDENTS OF THE HIGH-PRIEST THEME IN HEBREWS

By MARY E. CLARKSON

Philadelphia

How could the author of Hebrews feel confident that his readers would be prepared for the ascription to Christ of the office of high-priest? The Christian usage of almost nineteen centuries since the appearance of that book has rendered it a dear and familiar thought to us; but for New Testament literature it was an innovation. There are no traces of it in the Pauline Epistles, the Synoptic Gospels or Acts. In these the office of prophet, of King, of Son of Man, Messiah, Son of God, was, each in turn, ascribed to Him; but never that of priest. Nor do we find priests mentioned with favor in those books.<sup>1</sup> On the contrary, the Jewish priests are shown as attempting to hinder our Lord's work, to entrap him and to compass his death; and, after that, as persecuting his disciples. They had given "the people of the way" small reason to think well of them.

Yet, some decades after the Crucifixion, an unknown and eloquent writer ascribes to our Lord this very office, dwells upon it, magnifies it. In another book of about the same period as the

latest date assigned for Hebrews, First Peter,<sup>2</sup> the terms "holy priesthood," "royal priesthood" are applied to believers. Similar phrases occur in Revelations,<sup>3</sup> along with much imagery derived from temple rites, either directly or through reflection in prophecy. Finally, in the Fourth Gospel, the priesthood of Christ, though not explicitly declared, as in Hebrews, is adumbrated by various touches in the narrative, and, still more, by the great prayer of the Seventeenth Chapter.

This tendency is still more marked in sub-apostolic literature, where in the epistles of Polycarp, Ignatius, Clement of Rome and others, the epithets "Eternal High-priest," "Heavenly High-priest," "Thy beloved Son," and variants of these are applied to Christ, apparently as of normal usage. Now whether this trend is due to the influence of Hebrews on all these writings, or to some anterior influence affecting Hebrews as well, such a marked change calls for explanation.

The more one considers the crime of Caiaphas and the abhorrence it aroused, the more astonishing it appears that, be-

<sup>1</sup> Zacharias, father of John the Baptist, is the only priest spoken well of in the Synoptic Gospels.

<sup>2</sup> First Peter 2: 5, 2: 9.

<sup>3</sup> Revelation 1: 6.



tween thirty and fifty-five years after the death of our Lord, this unknown writer, pleading ardently for the loyalty of disciples, recognizes in the Victim of Caiaphas the very archetype and original of the office Caiaphas had desecrated, and counts, seemingly, on like recognition from his readers. He proceeds, to be sure, to qualify the attribution by referring it to a higher order; but the acquaintance assumed in his readers is not with the idea of Christ as high-priest of the higher and more primitive order—that is argued for—but simply with the idea of Him as high-priest (without qualifications as to order or degree). When St. Paul, in Romans, applied the doctrine of grace to the current problems of Jewish theology,<sup>4</sup> free-will, foreordination and justification, he could say with confidence, “I speak for those who know the Law.”<sup>5</sup> Otherwise how futile to treat of such questions! Like confidence the author of Hebrews apparently felt in his readers’ acquaintance with the idea of Christ as high-priest. The theme, however, is not brought into relation with the ministry or the Eucharist, as a modern reader would expect. It is set forth for its own sake, as a ground of assurance, and—more remarkable still—an argument for the finality of the Faith.

Now what had brought about such a change of outlook that the office could thus with deep fervor be attributed to Christ? This question is quite distinct from that of the authorship of Hebrews. It would still remain even if the authorship could be as indisputably determined as that of the *Divine Comedy*. Conversely, the answer would leave the

matter of authorship as much in the dark as Dr. James Moffatt expects it always will be.

It is, of course, to Acts that search must turn. As we penetrate into the movement that book describes, we become increasingly aware how much more must have been happening than could be contained in one slender volume, and how many, beside the Apostles, had a share in the spreading of the Faith. With the enlistment of eager disciples in evangelization, the unanimity of the little band in Jerusalem directly after Pentecost must, it would seem, have yielded to some variation of approach and development, merging into spontaneous cohesion.

The Apostles themselves are shown in the opening chapters of Acts in circumstances strongly contrasted with those experienced in Galilee. Instead of traveling from town to town, over the countryside, they were now settled in a city. Without opportunity for even the occasional pursuit of their callings, they were dependent on friends for support.<sup>6</sup> The criticism and hostility occasionally encountered in Galilee were exchanged for persecution in Jerusalem. Further, and of special import to this inquiry, instead of attending the plain services of the synagogue, they now worshipped in the Temple.

As Jews, they would look on the Temple as the glory of their nation, and on its elaborate rites as divinely inspired. As followers of Christ, they would remember His teaching there. Contacts with the temple ministrants, entailing converse about the Teacher who had so stirred the city, would be likely to follow

<sup>4</sup> Habakkuk had declared centuries before, “The just shall live by faith.”

<sup>5</sup> Romans 7: 1.

<sup>6</sup> Friends are implied (in the Gospels) in the loan of the ass and the upper room, as well as the gift of the sepulchre.

the frequent recourse to the Temple mentioned in Acts. Especially would this be so, if the allusions in the Fourth Gospel to the "believers" scattered among the listeners to Christ's preaching are to be accepted.

Hence, it is not surprising to read in the sixth chapter of Acts <sup>7</sup> that "a great company of the priests were obedient to the Faith." No attempt is made to connect the statement either with the immediate narrative or with later events; but that Luke, with a great story still to unfold, should have found place on his crowded papyrus roll for the bare mention of the fact, argues for its significance beyond the mere increase in numbers, noted in his preceding sentence. Its insertion between the appointment of the deacons and the story of Stephen suggests a connection with both of these closely related episodes. This may well be, since in general priests belonged to the party of the Sadducees, which was also the Hellenizing party, so that acquaintance between the two groups seems not unlikely.

Whether or not the two groups were in contact, the conversion of both, but more particularly of the priests, presented a grave difficulty to the rulers. It was one thing to be defied by obscure men from Galilee; it was quite another when members of their own order, committed to the denial of any resurrection, joined with these Galileans in proclaiming that of Jesus. For the rulers, the action of these priests was worse than a split about rites or doctrine, worse than mere desertion from their ranks. It was the reprobation of their own conduct by members of their own party. For, in the Primitive Church, the Resurrection of Jesus

was proclaimed first of all, not as the promise of immortality but as the vindication of the claims of Jesus. Belief in it therefore meant indictment of the rulers, not merely for gross injustice, but for transgressing the Divine will.

The challenge would be felt the more keenly if, as seems likely, there had been division among the rulers themselves about the crime of Caiaphas. A few, without the boldness of Joseph of Arimathea, may yet have been of his mind. Procedure against the priests, however, would involve embarrassing admission of their defection. Attack on the proselyte Stephen <sup>8</sup> presented fewer difficulties; and baffled rage at the priests probably sharpened the hostility aroused by the uncompromising tone of his address. Harsher measures now replaced the warnings, beatings and short imprisonments to which repression had been confined thus far, and the general persecution drove many from Jerusalem.

Concerning the fate of the priests St. Luke is silent; perhaps from want of knowledge, perhaps from regard for their safety. There was no telling into whose hands a volume might fall, or what chance <sup>9</sup> word might furnish a clue to pursuit. Perhaps the matter simply did not come within the scope of his narrative. St. Luke had a way of letting each character drop out of the story as soon as the episode in which he figured was completed, leaving the question

<sup>8</sup> How was the stoning compounded for with the Roman government? Perhaps, with help of a bribe, passed off as an outbreak of ruffians.

<sup>9</sup> Precaution may also explain the occasional vagueness as to time and place in the Third Gospel as well as Acts. If Mary and Martha were alive, "a certain village" would be prudent. When the Fourth Gospel appeared, it would be safe to mention Bethany. Luke can be precise enough at times.

<sup>7</sup> Acts 6: 7.

"What became of him afterwards?" to echo down the ages.

Without the protection afforded St. Paul by his Roman citizenship, these priests would be subject to no less unremitting hostility from the Jews. In all likelihood, then, they were among those "scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen," and, like them, engaged in preaching the word where they sought refuge—in Phenice or Cyprus or Antioch. If they found it advisable to put more distance between themselves and Jerusalem, and knew of the little colony of the disciples of John the Baptist settled in Ephesus some time after his death, they might count on hospitable reception there, the more especially if any of them were connected with the family of the priest Zacharias, father of John the Baptist. Travel was easy in the first century, and Christians turned up in remote places. On his second visit to Ephesus, St. Paul found "disciples," baptized only "into John's Baptism," whose status is the more puzzling because Apollos, in the like case, had so recently been instructed by Aquila.

If Ephesus were the goal of this company, and if their preaching took the shape presently to be suggested as most congruous with their circumstances, it should go far to explain the more favorable attitude towards the priestly office characteristic of the New Testament and sub-apostolic writings previously enumerated. For of these all except the Epistle of Clement are associated, either for provenance or destination, with Asia Minor.<sup>10</sup> While on the other hand, the

Didache, the Shepherd of Hermas and other sub-apostolic writings not thus associated, as well as the Apocryphal Gospels, make no reference to our Lord as high-priest, thus suggesting a possible regional trend in regard for that office.

Conjecture about unknown men may seem to have less to go on for their mode of presenting the Faith than for their place of destination; yet, although we are in the dark as to their names, we are not so as to their calling, and may be sure that their approach, though different from that of Peter, of Stephen and of Paul, would also in some degree be, like theirs, the outcome of experience. For temple priests, even if they<sup>11</sup> had not assented to the deed of Caiaphas, acceptance of Jesus as Messiah could hardly fail to cause mental conflict as severe as that felt by the persecuting Saul. If they had taken their calling seriously—and, even in a corrupt age, many must so have taken it—they could not forget their training and traditions, nor the place of their order in the national system.

Hence the piercing thought was not to be evaded that the hierarchy they belonged to, divinely appointed as their scriptures taught, had, by the condemnation of God's Chosen One, been guilty of defying the Divine purpose. Though the claims of Jesus had been vindicated by the Resurrection, the startling contradiction in the Divine plan remained.

Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, wrote to the churches of Asia Minor; the Fourth Gospel is quite generally assigned to Ephesus; while Hebrews, in dispute for origin and destination, is supposed by some authorities to be intended for a group in that city.

<sup>11</sup> Without intending to imply entire unity of thought in the group, "they" has seemed a less awkward mode of reference than "one or more of the number," frequently repeated.

<sup>10</sup> First Peter was addressed to the Christians scattered throughout Asia Minor; Revelation to the Seven Churches of Asia, a province of that peninsula; Polycarp was Bishop of Smyrna;

Aside from any sense of personal guilt, the breakdown of their order faced them, as the breakdown of the law faced Paul. How was the clash to be overcome?

From the idea of the fulfillment of prophecy in Christ's gracious acceptance of vicarious suffering, which was the Church's earliest interpretation of the Crucifixion, to the idea of voluntary sacrificial offering the distance is not great. "Since, then," they might reason, "Christ freely offered himself, was not He to be recognized as priest as well as victim? and—because it was the unique and supreme sacrifice—as High-priest? Thus, in spite of the defiance of the Jewish hierarchy, the divine purpose in its appointment, though still mysterious, still unfathomable, would be fulfilled.<sup>12</sup>

If reminded that the plea in Hebrews is centered, not on the Aaronic body to which the priests belonged, but on the ideal order of Melchizedek, it may again be pointed out that, underlying the argument, is the assumption of our Lord as priest left undefined. Now, while there can be no attempt here to trace the course of the ascription from its hypothetical origin to the finished treatise, it may nevertheless be remarked that, if the author was aware of a lingering reluctance to attribute to our Lord the office once held by Caiaphas, Philo's theory of the more primitive order might serve to overcome objections. To the modern reader, believing in the Incarnation and familiar with the analysis of Genesis, Melchisedech is perhaps more likely to seem an embellishment than a buttress of the argument.

<sup>12</sup> Metaphysical difficulties would still remain, as they remain in St. Paul's doctrine, and have never yet been banished from philosophical or theological theory.

In the path of conjecture thus far pursued from Heb. 2: 17, though Acts 6: 7 is not clearly marked out for the terminus, no more is it clearly excluded; nor, in following the path, have either available landmarks, or the nature of ground and climate gone unheeded.

At least the data can be presented. Looking backwards, then, from the unprefaced phrase in Hebrews, "that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest," implying the readers' assent, we note the absence in earlier New Testament writers of similar allusions or even of favorable mention of the office. Remembering next that where a plant is seen, seed must have fallen, we look for the sower.

Meeting these facts from the other end, we have, first, the changed situation of the Apostles in Jerusalem, especially their frequent presence in the temple; second, the statement of Acts 6: 7, not accorded valuable space without reason, and its insertion at a critical point of the narrative; third, the general pattern following conversion at that time; of persecution, escape to other cities, and the preaching of the word enroute; fourth, the presumption that, for the group in question, by reason of their former calling, the passage from Judaism to Christianity would engender profound inward disturbance; and finally, the probability that, as St. Paul's doctrine of Grace was the outcome of his experience of faith in Christ superseding the struggle over the law, so the conflict for these men might be resolved by the transfer of the dual character of ritual sacrifices to Christ's offering of Himself—an interpretation that would be spread in the area of their preaching.

Evidence for the presence of these

men in Ephesus is only inferential; but, if they were there during Apollos' visit, a link would be provided between the suggested source<sup>13</sup> of the idea and the most plausible guess, hitherto, regarding authorship. In the search for sources, whether of New Testament writings or trends, we are of course not confined to names recorded in Acts. That book furnishes ample evidence that many more took part in spreading the gospel than are referred to by name as so engaged; but outside that book and the epistolary greetings, we have no information about Christians of the period.

It remains to touch, though with hesitation, on another aspect of Hebrews of possible import to our theory. It is allowed that the references in that book to the sufferings of Christ are fraught with a poignancy not surpassed by the account of Gethsemane. The expressions: "For the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame,"<sup>14</sup> "In that he himself hath suffered being tempted";<sup>15</sup> "In the days of his flesh having offered up with strong crying,"<sup>16</sup> seem to reveal by their intimacy what Christ's sufferings meant to himself. The question then arises, Are such passages purely interpretative, or could the author have had access to an independent tradition?

Is it too bold to suggest that the statement in the Fourth Gospel, that Peter was admitted to the scene of the trial because in company with a disciple

known to the high-priest, may be relevant here? One so known would almost surely have further acquaintances among his household. Since Joseph of Arimathea had been moved by the story of Jesus, why not others in the same circle? If to one of these, on that terrible night, the disciple had let fall words heard in the garden, then the story of triumphant renunciation might have been passed from mouth to mouth in a sympathetic circle outside the band of recognized disciples, and, perhaps, even have contributed to the final decision of this group of priests to cast in their lot with the Apostles.

Again we are following conjecture; but, if the statement of Acts 6: 7 is to be accepted, must the event be regarded as occurring in *vacuo*, without cause or consequence, or relation to other events? Circumstances not explicitly connected in the narrative may yet have a bearing on each other.

Now, should the question as to whether the idea of Christ as high-priest was first given shape by the company of Acts 6: 7 (or even antedated Hebrews) seem of remote consequence, two aspects of its bearing on Christian beginnings may be pointed out. First, the early appearance of such teaching would indicate the need felt in the Church for a theory of our Lord's nature and sacrifice beyond the statements in St. Peter's sermons, and would show that an interpretation parallel to St. Paul's, and complementary to it, soon came into circulation in some regions. If, at about the time of St. Paul's conversion, others were likewise engaged in working out the implications of the story of Christ for the mind as well as the heart and conscience, the reason would appear that those implications had to be recognized

<sup>13</sup> Perhaps the regard shown in Ephesus for certain pagan priesthoods, due to the character of the officiants, should not be ignored as affording a favorable climate for the doctrine to grow in.

<sup>14</sup> Heb. 5: 7.

<sup>15</sup> Heb. 2: 18.

<sup>16</sup> Heb. 5: 7.



as inherent in it; and that the turn taken by St. Paul's explanation was a specialized form of the interpretation, called for by the story itself, not the direction of a remarkable socio-ethical movement into an alien dogmatic channel.

Secondly, since only an office of high honor could be attributed to Christ, the recognition of him in the quality of priest in any region, before the appearance of Hebrews, would signify in the same region an esteem for the office itself, which might conceivably have some relation to the vexed and obscure question of the development of the early ministry.

Aside, however, from the possibility that the theme developed in Hebrews had been derived from this group of priests, the mere fact of their accession to the Church has an importance not to be overlooked, in spite of its juxtaposition alongside the more interesting story of Stephen. The winning of converts from the party most inimical to it at

once raised the consequence of the Church in Jerusalem, and increased its peril, thereby opening the way to larger undertakings. That the Church should thus early have been able to draw to itself representatives from the leading currents of Judaism is indicative not only of the breadth of its appeal but of the force of the Apostles' testimony to the Resurrection.

Moreover, as these Sadducees came in before the conversion of the great Pharisee, the probable effect on him is not to be passed over. If he knew of the priests' conversion—and how could he fail to hear?—the knowledge that members of the party who denied any resurrection were now affirming that of Jesus, even while whetting his resolve to put down the dangerous sect, would stir within him misgivings. The fact of their joining the disciples was no more to be put aside than Stephen's fate at the trial. Paul must have carried with him both memories, as he set out from Jerusalem.

# "BLESSED IS HE THAT COMETH IN THE NAME OF THE LORD"

## A LITURGICAL NOTE

By CYRIL C. RICHARDSON

Union Theological Seminary

### I. THE PROBLEM

There is a growing custom in the Church for the priest to attach to the *Sanctus* the words, "Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest." These words are adapted from the cry of the people at the triumphal entry of the Saviour into Jerusalem (Matt. 21: 9). For brevity we shall refer to them as the *Benedictus*.

There are three reasons why this is an unhappy custom in our Liturgy:

(a) The words are sometimes said by the priest and not sung (as the *Sanctus*) by the people.

(b) They interrupt the natural sequence in our Liturgy from the *Sanctus* to the Consecration Prayer. The former ends, "Glory be to Thee, O Lord, Most High."<sup>1</sup> The latter opens, "All glory be to Thee, Almighty God."

(c) They break the unity of the *Sanctus* by an awkward and abrupt transition. The *Sanctus* is addressed to the Father, or to the Trinity; but the *Benedictus* is an exclamation referring to the Son.

The purpose of my note is to suggest that we restore the *Benedictus* to its original place in the Liturgy.

<sup>1</sup> This is a paraphrase of the second of the Hosannas, which was retained after the *Benedictus* was deleted from the 1549 book. Literally "Hosanna" means "O, Help!"

### II. THE EVIDENCE

The original place of the *Benedictus* would seem to be just before the Communion. We find it there in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii), as an anthem to greet the Triumphal Presence of the Saviour in the Blessed Sacrament. It is, indeed, somewhat expanded in this text, being preceded by a short form of the *Gloria in Excelsis*. But in the simpler form, and without the Hosannas, we find it in the same place in the *Testamentum Domini* (i. 23). Perhaps a vestige of this is to be seen in the anthem from Psalm 108: 26-27 (LXX) in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom. There it is sung by the choir when the deacon elevates the chalice just before the communion to the people.<sup>2</sup> Finally, in the Liturgy of the Abyssinian Jacobites it immediately follows the Epiclesis, and so gives added point to the Eastern doctrine of the consecration.

From these references it is clear that the *Benedictus* appropriately referred to the Presence of our Lord in the Sacrament. To place it before the consecration involves a two-fold difficulty: it deprives it of its essential meaning, and it confuses the structure of the *Sanctus* and the Consecration Prayer.

How did it ever get attached to the *Sanctus*? This is one of those irritating liturgical riddles, which it is difficult to

<sup>2</sup> It is wanting, however, in the ninth century Barberini Euchology.

solve. I shall not venture an answer, except the rather obvious one—viz. that one good exclamation seemed to deserve another. Rather shall I content myself with suggesting that it is a somewhat late and unfortunate insertion.

The early *Sanctus* certainly had no such appendage; and Egypt, the original home of the *Sanctus*, never adopted it in her liturgies. It is wanting in *Serapion*, and in both the Greek and Coptic versions of the Liturgy of St. Mark, as also in the Abyssinian Liturgy.

In Syria, however, it is appended to the *Sanctus* in both the Greek and Syriac texts of the Liturgy of St. James. From there it seems to have spread to East Syria, to Constantinople, and to the West—a typical example of bad Syrianization.

We cannot date its first appearance in the *Sanctus* with any certainty. The fact that it is found in both the Greek and Syriac versions of "James" is no assurance that it was therefore the Monophysite Schism, since the forms of the *Sanctus* and the *Benedictus* are not identical in both texts. Furthermore, the earliest text of "Chrysotom" gives us no help in the dating, as the *Sanctus* is there only indicated by its first word.

In the West there appears to be no evidence for it in the Roman Liturgy until the ninth century. It appears in *Ordo Romanus* II, and in one of the three manuscripts of the *Gregorian Sacramentary* edited by H. A. Wilson. It is likely that it is a Gallican importation of the early middle ages. Indeed, it is clear that the earliest Gallican masses (those of Mone) followed the Syrian custom.

The *Benedictus* is surely an interloper in the *Sanctus* of the Syrian and Byzantine liturgies. This is clear from the

fact that the original transition from the *Sanctus* to the Consecration Prayer is awkwardly broken by its insertion. In those liturgies the introduction to the Consecration Prayer was based on the threefold repetition of the word *Sanctus*. This was understood as a prophetic allusion in Isaiah to the Trinity; and the Consecration Prayer began with the declaration, "Holy is the Father; holy is the Son; and holy also is the Holy Spirit." This form (attested, incidentally, by Theodore of Mopsuestia and Narsi) is preserved in much the same way in the Syrian<sup>3</sup> and Byzantine<sup>4</sup> liturgies.

It was only in the Gallican and Mozarabic tradition that an effort was made to bring the *Benedictus* into the general structure of the Consecration Prayer. This was done by the varying *Post-Sanctus* Collects, which served to link the *Sanctus* with the *Qui Pridie* (the Institution). Many of these collects begin, "Vere *Sanctus*, vere *benedictus*, Dominus noster Jesus Christus filius tuus." This transition, however, is not always attempted, and cannot be viewed as too successful.

The dates of these collects vary, but as the attempt to relate them to the *Benedictus* is seen in the masses of Mone, the custom must go back beyond the seventh century.

In the Roman Liturgy the transition from the *Benedictus* to the Consecration Prayer was never smoothed out.

<sup>3</sup> Even *Addai* and *Mari* has it, but there is confusion in the text as the Consecration Prayer was originally addressed to Christ, and when the *Sanctus* was added the transitions were not smoothed out.

<sup>4</sup> The Egyptian liturgies took a different line, relating the idea of the heaven and earth as full of God's glory, to the petition to fill the sacrifice with His blessing.

Indeed, a sort of stubborn reluctance toward change characterised the Roman Canon. When additions were made to the primitive text, no effort was exercised to avoid unhappy (and even meaningless) transitions. This is as true of the introduction of the *Sanctus* itself,<sup>5</sup> as of the later *Benedictus*. The abrupt "*igitur*" of the first prayer of the Canon (which may well look back to the primitive series of Thanksgiving before the *Sanctus* was added) has remained despite the change.

Like the *Sanctus*, the *Benedictus* is thus a later insertion in the Consecration Prayer. But whereas the Eastern Liturgies made good use of the former, and smoothed out the transitions (which in such earlier texts as *Serapion* and *Addai and Mari* are abrupt and confusing), the *Benedictus* has remained an unhappy addition. Even the Gallican and Mozarabic attempts to solve the problem of a suitable transition are somewhat

<sup>5</sup> Probably in the Fourth Century, the form *Dominus Deus Sabaoth* being dependent on the Old Latin Version of Isa. 6: 3, and not on the Syriac *Sanctus* as Dom Dix contends in his *Shape of the Liturgy*, p. 538.

awkward. Indeed, they must perpetually remain so, as the *Sanctus* is addressed to the Father or to the Trinity, while the *Benedictus* refers to the Son.

The Western medieval Church perhaps had some feeling for this, when it used to delay the singing of the *Benedictus* until after the Greater Elevation. The custom has since been forbidden by the Vatican Gradual, but that is no reason for good Anglicans to follow suit!

### III. CONCLUSIONS

Should we not restore the *Benedictus* to its original place, as an anthem of the people after the Consecration and before the Communion?

(a) It is a highly fitting greeting to the Risen Lord, who after the Consecration is present in a unique way in the Liturgy.

(b) It would add a note which is gravely needed in our typically Western celebrations, which are centered almost exclusively in the sorrow of the Passion. Set to good music, it might displace the *Agnus Dei*, and express the sense of the triumphal entry of the Risen Christ into his Holy City—the Eucharistic Church.

## DR. CIRLOT ON APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION

By SHERMAN E. JOHNSON

Episcopal Theological School

*Apostolic Succession at the Bar of Modern Scholarship.* By Felix L. Cirlot. West Park, N. Y.: Holy Cross Press, 1946, pp. 77. \$0.50.

Dr. Cirlot shows himself in this pamphlet to be the most able defender hitherto found in America of the Anglo-Catholic view of holy orders and their origin. His earlier pamphlet, *Is the Catholic Church and Her Apostolic Ministry from Jesus Christ our Lord?* (reprinted from *The Holy Cross Magazine*), gives a fuller argument for the authenticity of Matt. 16: 17-19 and other passages; his most recent book, *Apostolic Succession and Anglicanism* (to be reviewed in a later number of this REVIEW), seeks to show that the Anglican Church is officially committed to the pre-reformation doctrine; and the present work attempts to refute the critical views of Streeter and others and to establish a theory of Christian origins which is essentially that of Bishop Gore and C. H. Turner. These publications form an architectonic unity, and if their demonstration is correct, the Episcopal Church can have nothing further to do with any schemes for the reunion of Protestantism which involve explicit or implicit recognition of Protestant orders; or, to put it in another way, the only possible reunion scheme would require non-episcopal churches to repudiate their previous ordinations. The mere fact that there is nothing essentially new in these arguments—except that Dr. Cirlot accepts certain of the methods and results of current New Testament scholarship and the older Tractarians did not—does not make the

issue less serious. It is high time for theological scholars to throw all possible light on our problem so that the clergy and laity may make responsible decisions. In this review there is no space for a detailed critique of the author's arguments, but the outlines of an answer may be sketched out.

Dr. Cirlot, after summarizing the "critical attack," lays down the thesis that it is not necessary for the Catholic Church to prove, by strict historical method, that "the facts which the Catholic position requires for its validity are facts" (p. 13). It is sufficient for the apologist to "show that the article in question was a part of the Faith of the Church at the earliest time for which determinative historical evidence is available, and that there is no conclusive reason to doubt the claim of the Church at that time that it had always been so" (p. 14). He then contends that Jesus Christ deliberately re-founded the Church and committed to the Twelve the plenary power to bind and loose; that the Apostles and the Twelve are one and the same, and that when other apostles were appointed it was only by the ordination of those who had been apostles before them. The crux of Dr. Cirlot's argument is found on pp. 32-37, where he insists that early Christianity accepted the theocratic and hierarchical principles of ordination, and also held that ordination was sacramental and its exercise



was restricted to certain persons. If all the foregoing could be demonstrated, the remaining parts of his argument would furnish little difficulty. I shall therefore largely confine my remarks to pp. 18-38.

The first difficulty is the idea of the Catholic Church as a perfect, self-contained theological *quantum*, with a clearly defined way of thinking and acting. Dr. Cirlot would undoubtedly agree that there was plenty of variety in the church of the second and third centuries, but he would insist that when the Church came to a general agreement on a point of faith or practice, it (a) always knew what the true historical facts had been, and (b) was always divinely guided to make the right dogmatic decision.

Although we all agree that in some way God "hallows and protects his Church," it appears to many of us that the Church of the New Covenant, like that of the Old, is always involved in the limitations and relativities of history. Hence the statements in Articles of Religion XIX and XXI. No constitution was laid out for it, no formal authority was conferred upon its leaders. With only the memory of Jesus' words and deeds, and the experience of the Resurrection and the gift of the Spirit in the fellowship, those who were best equipped to do so guided the early communities. The Church gradually felt its way, often by the trial and error method, toward a pattern of faith and practice which enabled it to survive and expand in the Roman empire and elsewhere. Historical necessity and practical wisdom justified the rise of the episcopate; the same necessity and wisdom justified the Reformation witness that the episcopate was not absolutely

necessary for the maintenance of church life; and they may once again justify the episcopate as one of the bonds of Christian unity. But the episcopate of Catholics is no more an absolute element in Christianity than is the believer baptism of Baptists or the synodical principle of Presbyterians.

Nor did the Church's writers at a given point of time always know the facts of its history. Some of the theories of the final author of Acts are, I am certain, a reading back of later practices into the primitive period, and some are guesses *ad hoc*. For example, the idea that the apostles supplemented certain baptisms with a gift of the Spirit ("confirmation") is just as mistaken as the assumption that St. Paul acquiesced in the "apostolic decree" of Acts 15 or that the "gift of tongues" conferred the ability to speak the languages of Parthians and Elamites. The theory of Luke and Matthew that all the Twelve were "apostles" is a case in point. The identification of the author of the Fourth Gospel as John the son of Zebedee is still another. It seems much better historical method to take the earlier primary source as the norm for judging the later sources—and this is why we prefer the evidence of Galatians and the Corinthian letters to that of Acts—than to use the later church tradition as the standard for interpreting the New Testament, as Catholic apologists generally do. Those of us who say this are aware that it does not make comfortable reading for everyone, and some of us at one time held a view like that of Dr. Cirlot, but we have been led to this conclusion by our attempt to understand the same historical sources with which he deals.

There are points in Dr. Cirlot's re-

construction which seem to me fatally weak.

1. One is his acceptance of Matt. 16: 17-19 as a genuine saying of our Lord. The Gospel of Matthew is no more tentatively "ecclesiastical" than Luke-Acts and the Fourth Gospel. But all these later writings have partly lost the perspective, and one does not find in the old pericopes of Mark and Q the same emphasis on the Church and its leaders. Most of the synoptic passages which can be cited to show ecclesiastical interests (Matt. 13: 24-30; 13: 47-50; Luke 12: 41-46; Luke 22: 29 f. = Matt. 19: 28) are oriented chiefly toward the eschatological Messianic kingdom. It is forcing the interpretation to suppose that Jesus committed to the apostles a monopoly of ecclesiastical power which would be used in organizing a worldwide missionary movement. Matt. 16: 17-19 and its companion piece 18: 18 are quite exceptional in the gospels, and I can only say that they seem to me to distort the picture of Jesus given us in the earliest sources. In any case, "binding" and "loosing" have to do with the rabbinic prerogative of declaring certain actions permitted or forbidden, and their background is the interpretation of the Old Testament law by rabbis. The context of 18: 18 shows that Matthew believed this power resided in the community generally, and was not confined to the leaders. Jesus appointed special disciples for the specific purpose of heralding the Kingdom. He may perhaps have promised that in the age to come, which God would bring in, they would take the place of the old Sanhedrin, but the framing of a constitution for a new church was not his interest. He did not even repudiate the Temple cultus! It seems tragic that

passages so doubtful as 16: 19 and 18: 18 should continue to be factors which hinder the union of the churches.

After the Cross and Resurrection everything was changed. Jesus' followers proclaimed him as risen, adopted the custom of baptism, and continued to carry on the Lord's Supper, which was a promise and foretaste of the coming Messianic banquet. Natural leaders came to head up the community. It is not necessary to suppose that all were appointed through visions of the risen Christ. There is a tradition that Christ in one of his appearances gave some sort of commission, but the content of it differs: in Luke-Acts the disciples are to be witnesses, according to John they have the power to forgive or retain sins, while Matthew thinks of it as a command to make disciples, baptize and teach. Some of the Twelve became apostles (incidentally it is doubtful if St. Paul ever refers to the "Twelve"; cf. J. Weiss, *History of Primitive Christianity*, I, 24), but it is not necessary to suppose that all did. The story of the choosing of Matthias (Acts 1: 15-26) is not good evidence for later practice, for its motive seems to be the completion of the sacred number by selecting a substitute for Judas Iscariot—perhaps to judge Israel in the age to come! Certainly a college of twelve was not permanently maintained. Apostles may have been appointed or recognized in various ways. There is no doubt that an apostle like St. Paul claimed a vast authority within the churches which he himself founded; but in the fifties the Church does not seem at all agreed as to who were apostles and how far their authority went. I am convinced that the "apostolic" passages in Matthew and Luke-Acts belong to a time

in the late first century when the more moderate elements in Christianity are appealing to the apostles and their tradition as a basis for unification.

2. But even if one accepts such passages as Matt. 10: 40 ("He who receives you receives me"), there is no authority for deducing that "He who receives those whom you send receives you and me." For example, Ignatius of Antioch gives no sign of knowing the theory of apostolic succession. His counterparts to the apostles are, in fact, not the bishops but the presbytery. He is quite as much a prophet as a bishop, and I suspect that, like Paul, he received his office "not from men, nor through a man." When he leaves for Rome, the church of Syria has only God as its shepherd and its only bishop is Jesus Christ (Ign. Rom. 9: 1). Why could not Ignatius, or neighboring bishops, have made immediate arrangements for a successor?

The rock of the apostolic succession theory is I Clem. 42: 4; 44: 1-3. Now it is not difficult to accept the statement that the apostles appointed bishops in the local churches or that (at least in some cases) they directed that "other tested men" should take office. But it is not clear that such arrangements were always made, or that the new officials were ordained by those who had already been ordained to the plenitude of apostolic power. If the Almighty wished it so, he certainly spoke vaguely through Clement, for the Roman writer is never exact or unambiguous. Those who ejected the Corinthian bishops probably did not accept the claim of apostolic succession, and Clement does not say to them that their apostle Paul had made arrangements for the future; he simply appeals to Paul's teaching about partisanship, and to support his teaching on

bishops and deacons he misquotes a passage from the Old Testament.

3. Dr. Cirlot appeals to what he calls the theocratic and hierarchical principles, and insists that New Testament ordination was sacramental and hierarchically restricted. I think we must agree that the New Testament church was theocratic in theory; i.e. it believed that God, and not the democratic process, conferred the *charismata*. This would be true whether the gift was mediated by other persons through ordination, or merely recognized. It is also true that there were different kinds of ministries. But it is not certain that one charisma was greater than the others and included all the rest, and I cannot find good evidence to establish the all-essential point that only certain ministers had the power to ordain others. Certainly the Simon Magus story, which is a legend of dubious historical value, is no proof. The earliest evidence that a charisma was believed to be conferred by the laying on of hands in ordination is in I Timothy. On this and other points, cf. M. H. Shepherd's article in this REVIEW, XXVI (1944), 135-150. One element in the theory of Sohm, Walter Lowrie and Shepherd is that the original essence of ordination was recognition, and the New Testament furnishes much more support to this than it does to the Catholic theory.

In this connection, one of the most obscure points is the rôle of the presbyter or elder in early Christianity. Sohm and Lowrie are certain that presbyters were simply the older men of the church, not an order of ministry. The theory of a succession of ordination, however, is closely bound up with the supposition that a man became elder by ordination. It is possible that the principal evidence

for the Sohm-Lowrie theory ultimately comes out of churches founded by St. Paul and his converts, while in certain other communities the ministry was modelled on the Jewish eldership. But it must be remembered that, in that case, only part of the early Church accepted the succession principle; that the way in which Jewish elders were chosen and ordained is a highly obscure question on which experts in Judaism are not agreed; and that the presbyterate, as an order of the ministry received in succession, may have been an afterthought.

The peculiarity of the theory so eloquently defended by Dr. CirLOT is that it combines an attempt to show that a particular historical sequence was possible with a religious belief that things happened in just that way. But in itself it is only one of several possible theories and, I think, not the most probable one. Would anyone have happened on such a reconstruction of the evidence if the apostolic succession doctrine had not been current in the later church? It is like one of those mystery stories in

which the reader is constantly led astray and the author produces the essential clue in the last chapter. Dr. CirLOT flies the honest colors of an apologist. He finds that the Catholic apologist is defended by two lines of trenches (p. 77); the first line has been heavily bombarded, but he thinks it will hold; the second line (by which he presumably means the Catholic Church's divine commission) he believes to be utterly impregnable. But many of us cannot see that this is the way to discover the true answer to what is strictly a historical problem. We believe that, in dealing with such debatable points as this, the churches must stand ready to revise their opinions in the light of historical investigation. Perhaps the most fundamental point at issue is this: should historical and theological studies be inductive, or should we think of our work as the holding of fortified positions protected by trenches? If the latter is the right rule, it is not only difficult to vindicate the Reformation, it is impossible to understand the Apostle Paul.

## BOOK REVIEWS

### *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament.*

By Norman H. Snaith. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1946, pp. 251. \$2.75.

Believing that in the traditional Christian synthesis of Hebrew and Greek thought the distinctive ideas of the Old Testament have been lost, Dr. Snaith here endeavors to set forth these ideas; which, in his opinion, constitute the real contribution of Hebrew religion. What he has given is in the main "a series of studies of the nature of God as He is revealed in the Old Testament"; with a concluding chapter on "what these particular beliefs involve for the New Testament" (p. 23). The ideas which he treats are the holiness, the righteousness, the salvation, the covenant-love, the election-love, and the Spirit of God. He traces the development of each from its primitive beginnings, insisting however that its true nature is to be found in its most developed stage.

A few of his conclusions may be stated. The distinctive Hebrew development of "holy" (*qodesh*) is to refer to Jehovah alone, and then, in the eighth century prophets, to those manifested characteristics which belong to Jehovah uniquely (p. 57). Righteousness is holiness with a special emphasis. Jehovah demands right conduct from His worshippers (p. 73). *Tsedeq*, with its kindred words, signifies that standard which God maintains in the world, and is therefore a religious rather than a purely ethical concept. It is more than pure justice, for it puts mercy before justice (p. 98). And it has a bias in favor of the helpless (p. 86). Thus, in the prophets and psalms, God's righteousness more and more becomes His salvation; a development which reaches its highest inspiration in Second Isaiah (42: 7; 49: 6; and in the Suffering Servant, p. 116). This shows that His covenant-love (*chesed*) for Israel is greater than His demand for righteousness (p. 153), and triumphs finally over Israel's sin. On the other hand, Israel's *chesed* to Jehovah involves "primarily a knowledge of God, and issuing from that, loyalty in true and proper worship, together with the proper behavior in respect of the humanitarian virtues" (p. 155). The loyal believer is *chasid*. "Favor" (*chen*), by contrast, is not a covenant word, and implies no obligation on God's part to show it. The "election-love" (*ahabah*)

of God for Israel is likewise unconditioned; "God found Israel and loved her" (p. 174). Israel in no sense deserved it. And it was marked by an "over-plus." "Israel's existence has always depended upon God doing more than was required" (p. 179). Israel, on its part, is asked to show towards Jehovah a humble, dutiful love (p. 180). The word "spirit" (*ruach*) "stands for power, strength, life, and all is of God and from God. The phrase *ruach adonai* (Spirit of the Lord) stands for that special power by which God inspires the individual man," enabling him to perform tasks wholly beyond his own strength (p. 203).

When seeking for these distinctive Old Testament ideas in the New Testament, Dr. Snaith follows the sound principle that one must begin with the use of words in the Septuagint rather than in the *koine* or in classical Greek. He finds that in Paul's writings the Greek *dikaioisune* is the Hebrew *tsedaqah*, which is used only to a limited extent in a juridical or ethical sense, and denotes mainly "the first stage in salvation." It "is actually what the Evangelical Protestant means by 'being saved,' and is followed by sanctification" (p. 218). In order to save men from sin, God forgives the sinner who comes to Him in faith and "thereafter enables him to accomplish that righteousness which in his own strength he was unable to do" (p. 219). Thus the Pauline order is "faith, salvation, works of righteousness, and not works of righteousness, salvation" (p. 221). God's election-love for man is *agape*, a "deliberate love that chooses" (p. 224). And *agape* signifies also the love that Christians have for one another, after the pattern of God's love for man. His covenant-love is expressed by Paul in the term *charis*, which blends with *agape* and therefore means both prevenient and covenanted grace (p. 226). To describe man's love for God, however, Paul uses, not *agape*, but *pistis* (faith). The Holy Spirit in both Paul and the Fourth Gospel is the power that alone convicts a man of sin and convinces him of the things of God. "By the Holy Spirit alone is a man born into that new life which is eternal" (p. 237).

The book is the work of a clear and vigorous thinker, who knows his Semitic languages and is well acquainted with the literature in the



field covered. It is characterized by sound critical judgment and genuine piety, and makes a welcome contribution to biblical theology.

FLEMING JAMES

*The University of the South*

*Preaching Values in the Bible.* By Corwin C. Roach. Louisville: Cloister Press, 1946, pp. viii + 299. \$2.50.

The Bible lays tribute on all who would really understand it and preach it. The price it exacts is unwearied research and patient study, the very equipment for which requires a knowledge of a wide variety of subjects, and special skills. Many truths lie on the surface and can be recovered by any earnest seeker. But only they can find the hidden riches beneath the surface who have subjected themselves to the discipline of patient study in such fields as literary and textual criticism, archeology, the Semitic and Greek languages, history and biblical backgrounds.

This is not what Dr. Roach says in so many words but it is implied on every page of his book in his search for the preaching values of the Bible. And it is this point of view, taken for granted by the author, that makes this treatise on biblical preaching not only different but unusually helpful to the modern preacher whose own training has doubtless been of this character. Even the method followed in large part by Dean Roach in developing his thesis reflects the assumption that only those who are qualified by sound scholarship can really lay bare biblical truth. His opening chapter, indeed, suggests how a frank facing up to the difficulties raised by scholarship can actually be a resource and yield positive results when handled properly. In this and in following chapters he illustrates his suggestions copiously. Other chapters in similar fashion suggest to the preacher how archeology, geography and the biblical languages open up areas for interesting and profitable preaching generally overlooked. In like vein there is an excellent chapter on Contradictions and Combinations in the Bible. The remainder of the book deals with preaching on the Bible as a whole; the several books of the Bible as related to the special circumstances that called them into being; and the Persons and Ideas of both Old and New Testaments.

Dr. Roach is widely familiar with the literature in this field and uses it to document almost

every page. In addition to offering the preacher many new ideas for preaching from the point of view of the modern use of the Bible the book is interestingly informative for all who welcome new light on the Bible.

HENRY H. SHIRES

*Church Divinity School of the Pacific*

*New Testament Life and Literature.* By Donald W. Riddle and Harold H. Hutson. University of Chicago Press, pp. viii + 263. \$3.00.

The underlying thesis of this book is that the New Testament books, while written primarily for instruction in the Christian faith, provide a definite clue to the history of the first century. They give, in addition to religious teaching, a clear picture of the religious, political, and philosophical movements of the time. The authors' purpose is to present "the results of scholarship to the student who is seriously interested in the New Testament as a book of literature, of history, and of religion."

Christianity, it is maintained, appeared as a small sect within Judaism, with certain clear-cut differences from that religion. These differences (such as the emphasis on salvation, the exaltation of Jesus, ecstasy, and use of the miraculous) were powerful enough to claim the attention of the Gentile world. The fact that Christianity grew into a world religion, as the writings of the New Testament testify, is proof that it presents a powerful, all-inclusive answer to the needs of mankind.

Several chapters on the unifying work of Alexander, the influences of Hellenism, and the first century religion of Judaism, and of the gentiles, form the background for the study of the actual writings of the New Testament. For the most part, the authors have stated fairly the differences between their point of view and that of other scholars. It would seem, however, that they are unduly dogmatic on one or two matters: as when they make the claim that Gentile mystery cults were the most important factors in shaping Christianity, and when they characterize the Fourth Gospel as having "a deliberate disregard for the historical . . . in favor of the mystical." It is to be noted that the conclusions concerning the letters of St. Paul follow quite definitely Professor Goodspeed's *Introduction to the New Testament*.

Nevertheless the book has put together in one volume very important information ordinarily to be found only after perusing many volumes. It has approached the problems of the New Testament writings from the general standpoint of form criticism, and is a most valuable introduction to the New Testament.

PAUL S. KRAMER

*Seabury-Western Theological Seminary*

*The Johannine Epistles.* By C. H. Dodd.  
London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1946, pp.  
lxxii + 168. 10/6.

Professor Dodd's commentary bears on one of its flyleaves a graceful and eloquent Latin dedication to the memory of James Moffatt, whose translation of the New Testament is used, and whose name is given to this series of commentaries. Such an inscription is especially fitting for this volume is—as one would have expected—one of the most distinguished in the series.

First of all, the introduction is all that one could ask. Professor Dodd proceeds carefully from point to point, establishing the high probability of his opinions, but nowhere claiming more than is legitimate. Specialists will already be familiar with one of these conclusions, which was set forth in an important article in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* for 1937, namely that the author of the First Epistle is not the author of the Fourth Gospel, but perhaps one of the latter's disciples, who is steeped in the thought of the gospel. The evidence for this is twofold: (1) the style of the epistle is more monotonous and narrower in range, and the epistle lacks the "Semitic" idioms characteristic of the gospel while it has some idioms and figures all its own; and (2) the doctrine is different. Quotations from the Old Testament are almost altogether lacking in the epistle. The "realized eschatology" of the gospel is practically absent, and the Parousia is near, for many "antichrists" have come. The death of Christ is an expiation for sin, the only "Paraclete" mentioned is Christ, the "Spirit" is the prophetic inspiration of the Church's teachers, and some passages of the epistle (2: 20, 27; 3: 2, 9) stand nearer to gnosticism than does the gospel.

Dr. Dodd deals patiently with the perplexities raised by the three epistles. For example, II John is evidently dependent on I John, but

the heresy is pictured as a new and alarming development. III John is an independent letter which has little necessary relation to I John, particularly since Diotrephes is never accused of heresy but only of insubordination. (As others have suggested, III John may reflect the shift of authority away from the apostles and their immediate followers to the local bishops.) But, although it is possible to scatter the three letters in three directions and to consider II John an imitation, Dodd (quite rightly, I am sure) thinks it best to suppose that all three are the work of one "Presbyter" of undoubted authority and prestige, and were composed in the province of Asia between A.D. 96 and 110 or thereabouts.

Such an introduction not only helps us to understand the situation of Christianity at this time, but sheds direct light on the three documents. Other illumination is given from gnostic writings and especially the Hermetic corpus, and Professor Dodd has obviously learned much from investigators such as F. C. Burkitt, Sir E. C. Hoskyns, and A. D. Nock, not to mention German scholars like Walter Bauer. All this learning is digested in the most helpful way for the ordinary reader. But the emphasis is placed on the meaning of the epistles themselves, and the beginner will want to turn first to the summary given in pp. xxii-xxvi of the argument of the First Epistle. This is particularly necessary for understanding a document whose arguments and themes go round and round. Very instructive too are the parallels between First John and the synoptics (pp. xxxviii-xli). The fact that *Matthew* furnishes the closest parallels is worth pondering, and it is curious that Dodd does not mention this.

Readers will no doubt be interested in some of Dodd's exegetical conclusions, for example:

The parenthesis in 1: 2, "concerning the word of life," is for the purpose of remarking that "my theme is the Gospel" (cf. Phil. 2: 16; Acts 5: 20; John 6: 68).

The "we" of 1: 4 expresses the solidarity of the Church of the author's time with the original eyewitnesses. This point is dealt with in a long excursus (pp. 9-16). Hoskyns, in *The Fourth Gospel*, had already given the same argument.

*Alazoneia* in 2: 16 is illustrated by a quotation from Theophrastus' amusing description of the *alazon*.

2: 19 shows that secession from the Church on doctrinal grounds is still a new and shocking phenomenon; but it has come about by God's providence, so that Christians might see that formal membership in the Church is no guarantee that a man belongs to Christ. Here Dodd might have referred to the picture of Judas in John 13: 30.

The *chrisma* in 2: 26 f. and the divine seed which, according to 3: 9, remains in man, are to be understood as referring to the Word of God or the original Gospel. Both of these are gnostic metaphors—the former known from Hippolytus to be used by the Naassenes, the latter attested by the Hermetics—but turned in an orthodox direction. Dodd frankly faces the contradiction between 3: 9 and the other ideas of the epistle. While the difficulty is mitigated by recognizing that the verbs in 3: 9 are in the present tense (“No one born of God commits sin habitually”), still this must not be pressed, and it is better to realize that at this point the author is dealing with a separate problem and is not using exact theological language.

3: 2 is to be interpreted, “Because we shall see God, we shall (as we know) become like Him.” “There is,” says Dodd, “no direct authority for this doctrine in the New Testament.” But II Cor. 3: 18 has much the same idea, as Kirk recognized in *The Vision of God*.

The three witnesses of 6: 8 are the living voice of prophecy and the two sacraments of the gospel. These attest that Jesus came not only by the water of his baptism but also by the blood of his Cross, i.e. his death was redemptive.

Such are examples of the richness of this book. It is a full and leisurely theological commentary, reverent and accurate.

SHERMAN E. JOHNSON

*Episcopal Theological School*

*An Outline of Biblical Theology.* By Millar Burrows. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1946, pp. xi + 380. \$3.50.

The study of biblical theology is not greatly cultivated among Anglicans, since for us the “theology” of the Bible has been as a rule limited to that of the separate books of scripture, or groups of books (e.g., the “Pauline” theology), while the synthetic or constructive part has been taken by dogmatic theology. The very idea of “biblical” theology, i.e., of a

theology of the Bible as a whole but without reference to creeds, articles, or other later formulae, is somewhat foreign to our ways of thinking. It seems to belong rather to those churches which, historically, have laid more emphasis on scripture than on tradition or ecclesiastical dogma (of course most of us do that in theory!), dogma being understood as explicitly and authoritatively defined doctrine. Certainly that is where the term “biblical theology” arose—in the post-reformation continental churches. The basic presupposition of biblical theology is that, for all the variety in scripture, variety in emphasis, in outlook, in interpretation, there is nevertheless a fundamental unity in its teaching. And since the scriptures of both Old and New Testament are inspired, the explanation of this fundamental unity is obvious: the Holy Spirit does not contradict Himself. In a general way, biblical theology may be viewed as one span in the bridge connecting the world of Hebrew-Jewish religious ideas and the faith of the New Testament with the later formulation of the faith in creeds and dogmas: but the bridge is continuous, and unbroken. “Biblical theology” ought at least to be the first volume in “Christian Dogmatics”—certainly in the “History of Christian Doctrine.” Others would view it as the foundation or basis for all later formulations, and their indispensable criterion. Still others would go even farther and say that the biblical theology is final, and no later formulations were—or are—needed, or possible. The point I would like to make is that for us Anglicans, biblical theology is important, ought not to be neglected, and even if not final (as taking the place of later creeds and dogmas) has a real place in the study and teaching of theology. A widespread revival of interest in biblical theology is taking place at the present time, and it ought to include us, even though our attitude toward the Bible is not quite the same as that of other churches.

Fortunately, Professor Burrows' book is available and will have a strong influence in guiding this revival—chiefly, perhaps, in keeping it from running on the shoals of crude, uncritical fundamentalism. For the book is thoroughly abreast of the latest work in exegesis, lexicography, and theological interpretation of both Old Testament and New. Each of the great doctrines—God, Man, the Universe, Christ, Sin, Salvation, and so on—is presented

historically, in its development in Old Testament, Judaism, and New Testament. The plan is somewhat like that of Dr. H. E. Fosdick's *Guide to the Understanding of the Bible* (1938), but the content is fuller and more detailed, and makes a greater use of expert exegesis. (A layman, or a Bible Class, might well begin with the *Guide* and then go on to the *Outline*.) Dr. Burrows makes no attempt to disguise lacunae in our knowledge: on some points we simply do not know what the prophets or our Lord or St. Paul taught, or thought; the sources do not tell us; and there is no use in pretending, for the sake of a rounded, systematic presentation, that our knowledge is complete when in fact it is not. This was the curse of much of the biblical theology of the past—especially the systematic presentations of Paul's "theology." Further, he gives a wealth of scripture references on every page; the *Outline* is in truth a guide to the study of the subject, and the details can (and should) thus be filled in by the student. Another decided advantage is the inclusion of New Testament ethics, worship, and institutions along with theology proper. There is a very brief bibliography, which might have been amplified enormously, but without adding so much to the value of the book as to its cost. Reference to other works in the field, and discussion of the views of other scholars, is slight; such material would also have made the book longer, more expensive, and less readable. The great value of the book is that it is just what it is called, an *Outline*. Considering the enormous extent of the subject, the author's success in maintaining a proper proportion and emphasis is a real achievement. It is the best book on the subject that American scholarship has produced. Long may it continue to guide students to a true appreciation and understanding of the "theology" contained in Holy Writ!

FREDERICK C. GRANT

*Union Theological Seminary*

*Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire.*

By Walter Woodburn Hyde. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1946, pp. viii + 296. \$4.00.

Dr. Hyde, who is professor emeritus of Greek and Ancient History at the University of Pennsylvania, is well known for his studies of classical antiquity. From the vantage point of the

classical historian he has sought to give in this book "an informative account within a reasonable compass" and "in the spirit of critical historical scholarship" of the ever-fascinating story of what he calls "the transformation of Christianity into a secularized institution during its struggle with the pagan order of the Roman Empire." One third of his volume treats of the religious environment of early Christianity, two chapters are devoted to the personality and the teaching of Jesus, and the remainder of the book traces the external history of the persecution and triumph of the Church to the end of the fourth century.

Despite the impressive array of learning in these pages and the remarkably clear and readable way in which Dr. Hyde has marshalled his wealth of facts, it is the judgment of this reviewer that the book fails to penetrate into the real nature of Christianity as a religion of redemption and thus it has no real clue to its triumph in the ancient world. The work belongs in the anti-supernaturalist, humanitarian, "scientific" school which sees the history of the Church as a progressive deterioration from the high ethical ideals of Jesus. It is the old thesis of Harnack with a vengeance.

The weakness of the book is best revealed in the chapters on Jesus. There is no awareness of the work of Form Criticism, nor of the newer trends of gospel interpretation. The Synoptics are used as historical documents because they supposedly present us with Jesus "as a man." We are told that "Mark as it stands is the oldest, as it is freest from mysticism and miracle"! The exploded theory of Hobart about the medical terminology of Luke is accepted. In attempting to portray the "personality" of Jesus recourse is had to the legendary cursing of the fig tree as an instance that he possessed "most human frailties." The bloody sweat of the agony in the garden is taken at face value without awareness that the best texts omit this passage. But the author is not always so literal. He can be drastic when it serves his presuppositions. For example he says, "Sacraments came later when the nascent Church, seeing that Jesus would not soon return, needed them for the organization of a continuing group. . . . They stem not from Jesus, but largely from the unconscious influence of the mystery-religions." The point of view—one can hardly call it a Christology—of the author is perhaps best re-



vealed in these sentences: "Jesus is still the best manifestation of the spiritual life known to the West, 'the genius,' as he has been called in the Roman sense of the word, of nineteen centuries past." "In studying early Christianity it is difficult to pierce the mist which envelopes some of Jesus' teachings as interpreted by his followers and notably by Paul whose ideas were largely alien to those ascribed to Jesus in the Gospels." The "notion of original sin, redemption, and grace was added to Jesus' simple ethics by Paul." If Jesus' ethics were so simple, one wonders why, as Dr. Hyde says in another connection, his "words and acts perplex his followers still."

The discussion of early Church history is superficial. Paul's break with Judaism is taken to be the real founding of the Church. No mention is made of the importance of the Spirit. Constantine is the source, of course, of most of the Church's ills. Dr. Hyde seems incapable of appreciating the better side of Church life in the fourth century or the remarkable leaders which Christianity produced in this period when "imperial favor had made the Church less virtuous." One would take St. Ambrose to have been nothing but a narrow-minded bigot. And I am inclined to think that St. Athanasius could hold his own as regards comparison with Zeno, if not Aristotle (see p. 204). The half-truth contained in this sentence is lamentable coming from one who has spent his life dealing with classical literature: "The Church had always been hostile to the classics and now being in power exploited that antagonism, though producing, in their place, little beyond dry and controversial theological literature." Where, if you please, is there any classical literature of great merit in the third, fourth and fifth centuries? One may call the sermons of Ambrose or the letters of Jerome controversial, but they are certainly not dry.

It is not so much Dr. Hyde's facts as it is his interpretations, or those subtle innuendoes between the lines, which makes his book so dangerous to the uninformed. There are, however, several errors which need to be corrected. Is it true to say that "the Stoic regarded his fellowmen as inherently bad and impossible of redemption"? It was Justin, not Jerome, who called attention to the similarity of the Eucharist and the rites of Mithraism (p. 65).

What can it mean to say of Judaism that "it was a religion of faith rather than of belief . . . founded neither on a revelation nor on the idea of a Savior-god" (p. 87). If any religion was founded on a revelation, it was most certainly Judaism. And what can we make of these statements: "Simon Magus, who tried with money to buy Jesus' [sic] power of healing to add it to his own" (p. 75); "St. Cyprian was banished and recalled by the Roman bishop Stephen I (254-257), but finally was beheaded by his successor, Sixtus II in 258—the first African bishop to achieve martyrdom" (p. 178). The popes have done some terrible things, but hardly this!

MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR.

*Episcopal Theological School*

*Anglo-Saxon Saints and Scholars.* By Eleanor Shipley Duckett. New York: Macmillan, 1947, pp. x + 488. \$5.00.

Miss Duckett's masterly book on the sixth century, *The Gateway to the Middle Ages* (Macmillan, 1938), induced the late Professor E. K. Rand to request that she "next show us what is within the portals." In this book she has taken us within the gateway along a path leading to England in the seventh and early eighth century. And it is sheer delight to go with her and visit the four saints whom she has chosen to represent the English Church of that age: Aldhelm, Wilfrid, Bede and Boniface. About the lives and writings of these men she has managed to give us practically the whole story of Christianity in Britain from the coming of Augustine to the middle of the eighth century. I have no complaint against her work whatsoever except that I wish there were more of it. Once having picked it up, I couldn't put it down. I do wish, however, that she could have squeezed in another chapter—one on St. Cuthbert. For it is quite likely that if one had asked the ordinary Englishman of Anglo-Saxon times to name his Church's greatest saint he would have replied without hesitation that it was Cuthbert.

Miss Duckett's organization of her material is fresh. Most writers on the period use Bede's narrative as a framework. But Miss Duckett starts off in Wessex, a kingdom about which Bede had but scanty information. It is a good place to begin, however, because Wessex was the "melting pot" of all the



manifold Christian traditions of the time—British, Irish, Roman, Frankish and English. Wessex also was to become that kingdom which made a political reality of Bede's vision of all the English tribes as "one people." Miss Duckett accepts without question the information about Birinus given by Bede. I myself have always had a leaning towards the view of Meissner that Birinus really was an Irishman. The summary dismissal of Agilbert as Bishop of the West Saxons she suggests was due to Cenwalh's "outlet for his temper" at his bitter defeat by Wulfhere of Mercia.

One of the most valuable features of Miss Duckett's narrative is her exposition of the writings of her heroes. Those who have not the patience to unravel Aldhelm's turgid style, nor the time to plod through Bede's works other than his history, will find in her pages a full view of the enormous productivity of early English Christianity. She points out in particular the importance of Aldhelm in the history of English literature, both as the father of the English passion for riddles and as the pioneer of Latin poets among the English. "It is surprising, indeed," she says, "that this double merit has not gained for Aldhelm wider renown among students of English literature." One might wish that she had given more of her own impressions of Bede as a historian, but she modestly says it would be a "waste of time" to go over the ground again. She has concentrated her attention on the lesser known, or at least less often read works of the scholar-monk.

The treatment of Wilfrid is more sympathetic than one usually finds in modern works. Miss Duckett has given more credence to Eddius' biography than one finds in Poole or those historians who follow his famous reconstruction of Wilfrid's life. Incidentally I notice that she generally rejects Poole's datings of events, although F. M. Stenton has accepted them in his magisterial *Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 1943). Her judgments on Wilfrid are certainly not uncritical. But I wonder if there is not one aspect of his stormy career that she has failed to bring out with sufficient clarity. Behind his conflict with Theodore and the other bishops one should detect the birth-pains of Western canon law. Both Rome and the provinces were to contribute to its development. Wilfrid's conflicts are an early example of that struggle which was to char-

acterize so many of the facets of medieval history—the Teutonic loyalty to personal leadership versus the Roman inheritance of law and order.

MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR.

*Episcopal Theological School*

*Toward a United Church.* By William Adams Brown. New York: Scribners, 1946, pp. xviii + 264. \$2.50.

When the list of "saints of the ecumenical movement" is written, the first draft will include Peter Ainslie, Charles Brent, William Patton, William Temple, Edward L. Parsons, and William Adams Brown. Perhaps only Dr. Brown could have left us this legacy of his intimate experiences as one of the guides of this great movement through its formative years.

The preparation for the modern ecumenical movement took centuries, but the actual development began as recently as 1910. An "ecumenical tree" traces the lineage of the World Council of Churches back to the Edinburgh Conference of 1910, and through the missionary, faith and order, and life and work movements to the present. Other converging lines from the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches and from the World Student Christian Federation came into the picture through the Amsterdam Conference of 1939.

The major work of the "creative decades" is summarized by Dr. Brown in the heart of the book, tracing the steps from Edinburgh to Stockholm, from Stockholm to Oxford, from Lausanne to Edinburgh (1937), and from the Jerusalem and Madras and other conferences which led to the formation of the provisional council. Then came war, and the "ecumenical Church" met that crisis by gaining strength.

The main value of this work is that it provides perspective. In less than 40 years, it is a surprise that so much progress has been made. The fear to face up to doctrine in 1910 led to the unsatisfactoriness of Lausanne and frankness led to the many victories for an ecumenical theology in 1937. At Oxford, a high-water mark was reached when the Archbishop of Canterbury celebrated Holy Communion for the entire conference, which would have been impossible a few years before.

The World Council is here: that is the empirical fact which makes all Christians rejoice. There are many barriers to further union, but

even the steps of the past 40 years seemed to be out of the question when the process began. The chief barrier is a *jure divino* theory of the Church, "which takes it for granted that God has given the Church a definite constitution which determines for all time the main lines of its government, doctrine and worship. The oldest and best-known example is the Church of Rome. . . . Anglo-Catholicism is a representative of this way of thinking in the Anglican family of Churches. Presbyterians have had and still have advocates of a *jure divino* Presbyterianism. Among the Churches of Congregational polity the Southern Baptists justify their refusal to cooperate with other Churches on the ground that these have departed from the New Testament doctrine of the Church" (pp. 21-22; cf. p. 184).

The place of the Protestant Episcopal Church in leading the development of the Faith and Order movement is described, giving due credit to Bishop Brent. There is a delightful story of how Bishop Weller reacted after he had joined Bishop Parsons and others in visiting the Pope to render an invitation to Lausanne: "raising his hand to heaven he shook his fist three times and expressed his judgment on the attitude of the Bishop of Rome in terms which were more forceful than complimentary" (p. 60).

This book should be on the reference shelf of every clergyman and every parish library. It is a simple and straight-forward account, ably edited with an epilogue by Samuel McCrea Cavert and with appendices giving the chief documents and a comprehensive bibliography.

RANDOLPH CRUMP MILLER

*Church Divinity School of the Pacific*

*The Living Liturgy.* By Massey Hamilton Shepherd, Jr. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946, pp. x + 139. \$2.25.

In acknowledging his indebtedness to the late Dean Ladd, Professor Shepherd modestly calls his essays "in a very real sense but footnotes" to the former's *Prayer Book Interleaves*. This they are—and more. They deal with kindred topics with the same high standard of liturgical scholarship, the same passion for reality and good taste, the same uncompromising loyalty to the truth as this Church has received it, the same basic principle of judgment: that liturgy is the corporate action of the worshipping congregation, the people of God. But Dr. Shep-

herd has an urbanity and reverence that are his own, draws more largely upon theological considerations, and in details shows ample independence of thought. It is most fitting that this complementary volume should be uniform with the *Interleaves*.

Some fifty short studies, most of which have appeared in *The Witness*, are grouped under the headings: Principles, The Daily Office, The Holy Communion, The Christian Year, Baptism and Confirmation, Music and Architecture. There are brief memorials to Dean Ladd and Frederic Whitney Fitts; and an appendix containing a suggested revision of the Baptismal Office.

Probably few will agree with *all* of Professor Shepherd's judgments and recommendations; but in every instance his reasons are cogently stated, and it is to be hoped that they will be received with frequent and emphatic approval translated into the sphere of action. Notable are his remarks on the place and use of the *Gloria in Excelsis*, his pertinent suggestions for developing the Ante-Communion into an effective vehicle of public worship in the present-day Church, his criticism of the feast of Christ the King, his criteria for the canonization of saints in a "modern, living liturgy," his decalog for choirs and rules of Church architecture. More questionable is his treatment of the thorny problem of intinction, his disparagement of the *Benedictus es*, and the observation (on p. 100) that "it is highly discourteous to the Almighty for (the Bishop) to sit . . . with a mitre on his head while praying: 'Defend, O Lord, this thy child.'"

If the Episcopal Church is to attain unity and cohesiveness it must be through renewed loyalty to the Prayer Book—a loyalty in which reverence for tradition is balanced by intelligent criticism, and in which the historic fact of the Reformation is neither ignored nor made a fetish. In the creation of such an intelligent and discriminating loyalty, books such as this, whose learning is sound and temper sane, can help enormously. They can deliver us from the *ignis fatuus* which Father Fitts had in mind when a few years ago he wrote these salutary words:

"Common sense should deter us from introducing ceremonial made up by the parson according to his predilections and idiosyncrasies, while both loyalty to our own Communion as well as common sense should lead us to follow

Anglican tradition and not look to a foreign Communion for guidance."

*The Living Liturgy* is a splendid commentary upon this wholesome thesis.

PERCY V. NORWOOD

*Seabury-Western Theological Seminary*

*Man as Sinner in Contemporary American Realistic Theology.* By Mary Frances Thelen. New York: King's Crown Press, 1946, pp. xii + 223. \$2.75.

One of the most significant reactions in theological thought has been the restatement of the Augustinian doctrine of man in terms of the contemporary social situation. The main emphasis is on man as a sinner, and in the beginning the statement was a negative reaction to "liberal" ethics and anthropology. The major prophet of this sojourn into the past is Reinhold Niebuhr, whose Gifford Lectures on *The Nature and Destiny of Man* provide the most important treatment of the Christian faith during the past decade. This volume, therefore, centers its approach in Niebuhr's analysis of the decline of liberalism and the rise of a movement which is theologically to the right and politically to the left, beginning with *Moral Man and Immoral Society* (1932) and following with a series of brilliant volumes which culminated in the Gifford Lectures.

The largest portion of this excellent volume deals with Reinhold Niebuhr, but there are chapters on other theologians who either independently or under Niebuhr's influence have made their own distinctive contributions to a similar view of man: Walter M. Horton, Robert L. Calhoun, John C. Bennett, and H. Richard Niebuhr. All of these men have a large following in the seminaries and among the clergy of this country, and recent developments in the Episcopal Church (e.g. Charles D. Kean's *Christianity and the Cultural Crisis*) show a debt to this same point of view. It is impossible to teach Christian ethics today without using books by the Niebuhrs, Bennett, Brunner, and William Temple (Brunner and Temple representing the European and English counterparts of the American movement).

The author builds up a background for the rise of "realistic theology" by briefly summarizing the thinking of Tennant, Hocking, and Harrison Elliott, and in the secular realm Marx and the Freudians. After the extended

treatment of the American realists, she turns to her own constructive statement. Her two "reflections at the end of an essay" are (1) a question concerning "the description which realistic theology offers of the origin of sin, and (2) the doctrine of the inevitability of sin as that is affected by the way in which sin is defined" (p. 199). On the first point, she brings psychoanalysis to bear upon the problem, for the fall into sin and the fall into neurosis are dual aspects of the same pattern and thus provide "two independent reactions to two different aspects of experience." There are multiple causes of actual sin, of which original sin is only one. The realists also stress sin as imperfection, whereas the liberals talked of sin against possibility, and it is the author's contention that the only way out of the ultimate pessimism of Niebuhr's thought is to see God's will at work in the processes of possibility as well as in the perfection beyond history.

Of course, all these realists have not lost their liberalism. "A Changed Liberal—But Still a Liberal," wrote John Bennett; "A Liberal Bandaged but Unbowed," wrote Robert Calhoun; "Between Liberalism and the New Orthodoxy," wrote Walter Horton—all in *The Christian Century*. And Professor Thelen has showed that she wants to keep the liberal insights which Reinhold Niebuhr has too easily thrown overboard. Her "reflections" need further expansion to make clear what she would do with "man as sinner," but she at least would get man beyond the frustration of an "impossible possibility" and onto the path of the hope for salvation.

RANDOLPH CRUMP MILLER

*Church Divinity School of the Pacific*

*The Challenge of our Culture.* Edited by Clarence Tucker Craig. New York: Harpers, 1946, pp. xiv + 205. \$1.50. *The Church and Organized Movements.* Edited by Randolph Crump Miller. New York: Harpers, 1946, pp. xvi + 255. \$1.50. (Volumes I and II in "The Interseminary Series.")

The outstanding thinkers of American Protestantism, largely but not entirely from the professional graduate schools, have united in producing a series of five volumes, of which these are the first two. Men of a variety of denominational loyalties and of different educa-

tional background, but who are united in their common conviction that the Christian faith is concretely and specifically relevant to this modern world of historic tension and social cross-currents, have joined in this enterprise. The first volume, edited by Dr. Craig, of the Yale Divinity School, assesses the arena in which Christianity faces its modern struggle for existence, while the second volume, edited by Dr. Miller of the Church Divinity School of the Pacific, discusses the other contestants in the field.

While there is no doubt that the *Interseminary Series* is a noteworthy attempt to do two things—to present a common Christian front along which modern Christian thinkers can take a stand shoulder to shoulder against the rising forces of anti-Christian thought and action, and also to present an exhaustive and thorough analysis of the modern world from the central position of modern Christian faith—we still have to wrestle with the problems of symposia. Even though the authors worked together and read each other's papers, and even though the editor in each of these two volumes has obviously done a masterful job of generalship, there is the fact that an inevitable unevenness, resulting from the method, is involved in performing this very desirable task. This reviewer sees no way by which this could be avoided, and believes that it is the price of making the attempt.

Seven authors joined in the preparation of the first volume, one of them—Dr. Buell Gallagher—also contributing to the second book. The introduction by the editor makes certain assertions about the Christian view of man and of history with which few people who would ever be concerned with the series could quarrel. Then the body of the volume presents an analysis of the sociological and spiritual results of a mechanized age, the problem of power in its modern form, the clash of races as one of the most serious symptoms of the underlying problem of a culture which is searching for its soul, the psychological interpretation of the modern age, and two general assessments—one of the prevailing spirit of modern times and the other of the church as known in modern society.

Dr. Haroutunian's analysis of dimensions of the spiritual problem of a mechanized age is easily the outstanding essay in the book, while Dr. Arndt's discussion of the cross-currents of

power is a profound analysis of the living situation for people today. While the other essays are valuable contributions to general understanding, particularly Dr. Gallagher's context for the racial problem, and Dr. Horton's understanding of the significance of personality maladjustment, the book as a whole does not quite live up to the promise of the two opening essays. Possibly this is because the authors are not quite clear as to what is meant by culture, or that they have not reached a common appreciation of this concept in its profundity. Dr. Wilder's essay, while it deals with the real problem of the need for a common basis of value in modern culture, tends to be too breezy an article for the company in which it is placed.

The second book, all the authors of which live on the Pacific Coast, is on the whole decidedly inferior to the first. Dr. Miller admirably presents the problem—the realization that there are religious and quasi-religious movements in modern life which compete for the support of people, so that the realistic Church must understand both their resources and the kind of resistance they offer to the Christian gospel. But since the category, religion, is assumed to be understood, when obviously it is not, the presentation of these various movements—many of which are very significant—tends to be descriptive rather than profoundly analytical. For one who would like to know what is going on in the world, Volume II is a valuable handbook of miscellaneous information on the borderland of religious activity, but for one would try to assess the origin and meaning of the conflict with Christianity, Volume II has surprisingly little to say.

After Dr. Miller's introduction, the book considers in turn organized secular radicalism, fascism, social welfare programs, fraternalism, organized education, the cults, and non-Christian religions, ending up with a beautiful, simple and straightforward evangelical sermon by Bishop Parsons, which tries to tie the volume together, and fails chiefly because one cannot tie a catalogue together that way. The defect of the book is most conclusively demonstrated by the chapter on fraternalism, which spends pages of valuable space listing the membership in various clubs and groups in some city, comparing these numerically with church membership, but drawing no significant correlation.

After these negative comments, it must be



stated that Dr. Trueblood's article on the new comparative religion is excellent, and would be a masterpiece if he had delved a little more deeply into the meaning of religion as religion. Dr. Gallagher has again done a workmanlike job in setting the philosophy of modern social work in the religious perspective. But even these essays, like the others in the book, suffer from what may be a necessity—to devote disproportionate space to a survey history of the evolution of the movement under consideration. This is fascinating reading in an informative way, but it does not particularly develop the volume's thesis.

Yet, the fact remains that the Interseminary Series is trying to present a kind of *summa* in terms of the relevance of the Christian Gospel to the modern world. This is a worthy task in co-operative apologetics, and the shortcomings are possibly due more to the difficulty of making a co-operative attack upon a problem of such scope than to any other factor. Even with the defects listed, the books are worth reading, and the series as a whole is to be commended on the basis of the first two volumes.

CHARLES D. KEAN

Grace Church, Kirkwood, Mo.

*Christianity Takes a Stand.* Edited by William Scarlett. New York: Penguin Books, 1946, pp. iv + 128. \$0.25.

Every churchman will rejoice that these essays have appeared in a form in which they are bound to reach a wider audience than they will through the more formal book, *What Christianity Can Contribute toward a Better World*. Bishop Scarlett and the Joint Commission of General Convention on Social Reconstruction have put us all in their debt in finding this medium of bringing before the general public the thinking of Christians as Christians upon the immediate problems of our civilization. Here the Church puts her best foot forward. In case any readers of this REVIEW do not already know it, the book is a series of papers written by Eleanor Roosevelt, Stringfellow Barr, W. Russell Bowie, Arthur Compton, Frances Perkins, Reinhold Niebuhr, Edward Heimann, Edward L. Parsons, Sumner Welles, W. E. Hocking and Angus Dun, discussing questions of world and domestic order ranging from our relations with Russia to the minorities question, the Negro problem and full employment.

The book entered a stream which is turning out to be a torrent of publications on the same theme. That is all to the good. This reviewer, however, keeps looking for a clear recognition of the situation set forth in Dr. Barr's statement, which by this time has become a classic: "I suspect we could still rebuild the civilization we have now all but destroyed if we could find the right questions to ask ourselves. But that is not why we ought to ask them. *Civilization would be one of the things added unto us if we sought first the Kingdom of God.*" It seems like a descent to the petty, certainly to the prosaic, to say that it is in the realm of first principles that the hardest thinking (after earnest prayer) needs to be done.

HOWARD HENRY HASSINGER

Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

*Problems in Religion and Life.* By Anton T. Boisen. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1946, pp. 159. \$1.50.

Dr. Boisen poses certain basic premises regarding the pastoral relationship. The minister is privileged to have a special and peculiar *entrée* to the homes and lives of his people. He need not wait for catastrophe but can offer his services in advance. He should see all personal problems in their social setting. He needs, therefore, an understanding of human nature such as can be achieved only from the study of "the living human documents."

The book itself contains three major divisions; Preliminary Studies; Types of Maladjustment; and General Problems. The first section consists of several outlines or questionnaires which should enable the pastor to make an exhaustive survey of the community, the home or family, and the individual.

The material in the other two divisions is decidedly limited. It is regrettable that the author (who is an authority in this field) restricted himself so severely. Such important subjects as alcoholism, sexual maladjustment, and delinquency cannot be discussed adequately in chapters of only six or seven pages. There is a short but comprehensive bibliography at the end of each chapter, but few if any of the more recent books are included.

Perhaps the author has sought only to point out areas of conflict and need, and to suggest approaches for further study. For most parish



clergy this does not suffice. They still rightly want to know what pastoral therapy they can perform. Although Dr. Boisen has not included many of the questions peculiar to the parochial ministry, it must be remembered that he has given tirelessly and effectively to a specialized ministry.

ROLLIN J. FAIRBANKS

*Massachusetts General Hospital*

*Banner of Jerusalem.* By Jacob B. Agus.  
New York: Bloch, 1946, pp. viii + 243.  
\$3.00.

Two reasons make this book very important to every disciple of the wise or lover of God. These are the excellent discussion of mysticism and of Zionism and its religious fervor.

This book extends and improves upon the earlier work of Rabbi Agus, *Modern Philosophies of Judaism*. The title for the volume is derived from a short-lived society of Zionists projected by Rabbi Kuk.

The biography of Rabbi Kuk is not rich in external details, although it extends into Russia, Switzerland, England, and Palestine, and includes brief internment in a concentration camp as "enemy alien." By appointment of the government, he became Chief Rabbi of Palestine. At his death in 1935, Rabbi Kuk had been serving as Rabbi in the Holy Land for over thirty years.

Trained in the most thorough Talmudic discipline, Rabbi Kuk (himself son of a rabbi) married the daughter of a rabbi. He became an original mind, of deep saintly piety. Compelled by events to take active, leading part in the difficulties of the Jewish people, he was nevertheless an authentic mystic. It is unusual to find mystics among those of great erudition, or among the responsible leaders of public affairs, but Rabbi Kuk was a true witness of the spirit. His influence will count in the present revival of interest in mysticism.

Rabbi Kuk was an intellectual leader among Jews who are variously called "orthodox," "Torah-true," traditional, devoutly pious, or "old world fundamentalists." None of these descriptive words accurately conveys the philosophy and religious understanding of this group. Rabbi Agus, through the life of Rabbi Kuk, gives an excellent picture of the dilemma and convictions of orthodoxy in Judaism.

Zionism is a movement of intense religious

fervor. This has been overlooked, or misrepresented, in many circles of late. Rabbi Kuk was a firm believer in Zionism. "The intensification of Jewish national feeling . . . restores to the Jew the sense of being rooted in God's world, and encourages him to be true to the deeper springs of his own being." Love of nation, and its history, is an essential tenet of deep and true faith as a Jew, which does not contradict the universalistic teachings of Judaism.

An example of a biblical ordinance, taken literally, which affected Zionism is that of the sabbatical year in which all farms were to lie fallow. "Six years shalt thou sow thy field . . . but the seventh year shall be a Sabbath of rest." In 1909, and since, Rabbi Kuk has, on full religious grounds, departed from strict literal enforcement of the Biblical rule and has permitted uninterrupted agricultural development. His reasoning was based, in part, on his national and Zionist sympathies.

Rabbi Agus has written a mature and persuasive account of a noble, saintly religious genius of our times.

DAVID B. ALPERT

*Boston, Mass.*

*The Nature of Metaphysical Thinking.* By Dorothy M. Emmet. Macmillan, 1946.  
\$3.00.

This is a very serious and remarkable book. The author deals with the most disputed and most profound problem of all philosophy. Her discussion is penetrating, sagacious, stimulating. It covers a vast field of themes: the theory of knowledge, the methodology of science, religious symbolism, the nature of revelation, the relation between philosophy and theology (which is the most difficult and burning question of our day), the logic of history, and finally the crucial and central subject of the book, viz. the fashion of a metaphysic which would satisfy all the intellectual and spiritual needs of our present time. What a scope of experience and learning and reflection!

I read the book with an ever-increasing interest and I am grateful for much instruction received from it. Miss Emmet is a courageous and conscientious thinker, sometimes witty and even sarcastic. Her judgments are well considered and balanced, and her position, I think, is typically English, but modified by a

wide knowledge of Greek and Medieval and German speculation.

She believes in the possibility of an "analogical" metaphysics which would cope with the intricate difficulties of an epistemological realism, making allowance for a part the mind plays in all processes of thought; which would also cope with the demands of a theology which rests upon revelation (although she would reject the anti-philosophical attitude of the Barthians); which would furthermore cope with the historical self-consciousness (although she would wisely deny the pretensions of historical positivism in all realms, even in theology itself); which would finally cope with the political and social confusions and uncertainties of our post-war world and with the modern feeling as it is expressed in poets like Proust and T. S. Eliot and others.

I should have to write a book on this book, if I were asked to state what I think about the truth of Miss Emmet's statements. On the whole, I agree with her cautious, moderate, subtle, and prudent reflections—they resemble my own views as presented in my American books. I doubt, however, whether Miss Emmet does fully understand Kant—she does not seem to see how near she is to Kant although she says in the beginning: "We need a new Kant rather than a new Hegel."

Especially I agree with her critical remarks on Cassirer and on Barth, on Kierkegaard and the Existentialists, but I think she is too deeply dyed by Whitehead, although she is independent enough to criticize his system too. But there is a strain of "physical realism" or of "scientism" in the book which I would restrict more than she does; and I would instead enhance the significance of spiritual experience and biblical theology. But I cannot enter here into a discussion about these points. I may only say that the term "symbol" as used in mathematics and physics should not be confounded with religious symbolism in any way, and also that the term "analogy" should not be used equally to characterize scientific and theological (Christian) thought. There is, as Miss Emmet herself admits, a leap when we ascend from the realm of perceptual and intellectual experience to that of the "Spirit."

At the end the author of the book confesses that our time does not yet allow any constructive metaphysical doctrine—for many

reasons, but particularly because "we no longer live in a common civilization which speaks a common intellectual language" (p. 221). But out of our present sorrows and apprehensions, our needs and necessities, "a new analogue may be born" (p. 224).

All readers, I believe, will be thankful for both the fine discretion and the vigorous faith which animate the pages of this self-expression of a cultured and noble soul.

RICHARD KRONER

*Union Theological Seminary*

*The English Way.* By Pierre Maillaud. Oxford University Press, 1946, pp. vi + 312. \$3.75.

The author, a Frenchman who had lived in England a decade and a half when this book was published, writes with sympathy and insight concerning English life and institutions. He finds that the whole pattern of education and justice in that country concern themselves primarily with behavior and not with motives and impulses. From this it is easy to see why English politics are usually quite realistic and have a strong sense of what is feasible. For a variety of reasons English institutions have in them the four elements necessary to survival: continuity, flexibility, adaptability and equity. These factors meant that England came out of the war with her institutional life largely intact.

Mr. Maillaud is of course forced to place the blame for the débâcle in British foreign policy in the "thirties" where it belongs: with the National Government which held the reins of power from 1931-1938. At first there was an attempt to embark on a new imperialism, an attempt which had much in its favor from a realistic point of view. But during this time there was no European policy, only a refusal to face issues, together with the idea that anything disagreeable could be referred to the League.

No Englishman could quite get serious about the idea of invasion until after Dunkirk, for the country had had no frontier wars for almost three and a half centuries. This fact alone was bound to condition the Englishman's mind and it certainly did, almost to his destruction. The very slow rate at which British foreign policy began to harden against the aggressor nations is in part explained by the fact that

Great Britain knew that she had to carry with her the influential portions of the Commonwealth when and if she entered into war with Germany. The various Commonwealths took time to see the danger, and to accept their share of responsibility in the conflict that was soon to come.

After the Battle of Britain, when she was concerned solely with survival, British war strategy slowly imposed itself on the Germans and their allies. Germany was forced into an extended war when Churchill amazingly and heroically sent an army to Egypt. The

Germans were committed to an extensive and expensive submarine warfare in the Atlantic, while England managed to hold the great masses of her forces intact until the United States had recovered from Pearl Harbor.

The greatest question now is: Will Europe now be England's prime concern? The author thinks that England must decide to follow the European path and to follow it with decision and continuity if Europe is to be saved from further chaos.

JOHN HIGGINS

*Gethsemane Church, Minneapolis*

## NOTES ON NEW BOOKS

*Outlines of Judaism.* By Samuel Price. New York: Bloch, 1946, pp. xiv + 222. \$2.75.

The subtitle of this book by Rabbi Price of Springfield, Mass., is "A Manual of the Ceremonies, Ethics and Practices of the Jewish People," and its purpose is "to serve as a textbook and guide for the religious school, for the home, and for prospective newcomers to the Jewish fold" (p. vi). This confirmation manual—for it amounts to that—appears to be Conservative, rather than Orthodox or Reformed, and it presents as fair a cross-section as one can give of the non-hierarchical, congregational fellowship which Judaism is. It can be heartily recommended to any Christian who wishes to know about the beliefs and practices of present-day Jews, and (since much of this body of tradition is as old as the first century) it throws some light on the spirit and method of the Pharisees and therefore on the beginnings of Christianity. If at times the language appears dogmatic and confident, and the explanations are over-simplified, let it be remembered that our own confirmation manuals are like that too. "O wad some Power the giftie gi'e us. . ."

S. E. J.

*England's Greater Churches.* A Pictorial Survey with an Introduction and Commentary by C. B. Nicholson. London: B. T. Batsford, Ltd.; New York: Macmillan, 1946, pp. 66 (not numbered). \$2.25.

This book contains 98 magnificent photographs of cathedrals and abbeys, each with a

brief and useful note. Mr. Nicholson's three page introduction consists of a good brief survey of the history of mediaeval cathedral architecture. The pictures are chosen in such a way as to give the best possible survey of the variety and beauty of these noble fabrics. One who studies them will know what he wants to look for when he next visits England.

S. E. J.

*The Lives of the Prophets.* By Charles Cutler Torrey. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1946, pp. iv + 53. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, \$0.75.

This consists of a preface, introduction, Greek text, translation, and appendix, and is Volume I in the new Monograph Series of the *Journal of Biblical Literature*. The document which is here edited exists in four Greek recensions—two of them imbedded in the works of Epiphanius, one formerly ascribed to Dorotheus of Antioch, and one in Codex Q of the Greek Old Testament—and is also found in a Syriac version. Dr. Torrey believes that the little book was originally written in Hebrew, and that the Q recension is, on the whole, the best representative of the original.

The earliest recension of the book is entirely Jewish in its interests and tone, with the exception of part of the legend of Jeremiah. According to this, Jeremiah prophesied that the Egyptian idols would be shaken when a virgin should arrive in Egypt bearing a child of divine appearance (*σὺν βρέφει θεοειδεῖ*); also that all the Gentiles would worship a piece of wood (*ξύλον*; i.e. the Cross). Dr. Torrey does

not, however, consider this a later interpolation. His solution is that a Jew of Jerusalem wrote the book before the year 80 A.D., and that he accepted and placed in his collection a legend of Jeremiah furnished to him by a Jewish Christian from Egypt.

A fair and careful assessment of Dr. Torrey's theory will require some time and labor on the part of specialists. As a first impression, one may remark that the virgin passage resembles Matthew's birth story and the simplets hypothesis is that the writer was dependent on the gospel. Perhaps there is also a reminiscence of Ignatius Eph. 19, where the appearance of the star at Jesus' birth signalled the destruction of all magic. As for *proskynesis* of the Tree—can this be earlier than the fourth century? If, however, most of this little book belongs to the first century, it is surely a welcome addition to our sources. In any case, Dr. Torrey and the Society are to be congratulated for publishing it.

S. E. J.

*The Apocrypha.* By Solomon Zeitlin. Philadelphia: The Dropsie College, 1947, pp. 30.

This reprint from the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, n. s., XXXVII, 3, is a thorough review of C. C. Torrey's *The Apocryphal Literature*, a book on which I commented in an earlier number of the *ATR*. Because it contains a great deal of new data on the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha it is especially worthy of mention here. These "outside books" contain a mine of information which New Testament specialists have only begun to touch.

S. E. J.

*Tips to Teachers.* By Vernon McMaster. New York: Morehouse-Gorham, 1946, pp. 99. \$1.25.

This little book accomplishes a great deal in its ninety-nine pages. It is not a profound treatment of the subject of pedagogy and is not intended to be. It gives the essentials of Church School instruction methods in sugar-coated form. It is brief, readable and helpful.

Dr. McMaster describes the conversation and discussion of five young people, who come weekly to their rector's study, where they are wisely led in thinking through the problems of religious education in the teacher-pupil relationship. While the fundamentals of teaching are

presented and the importance of the work emphasized, there is nothing to alarm the average layman as to his ability to teach. The book ought to be in every church school library and read both by active teachers and by those preparing to teach. A splendid feature of the book is that it creates a desire to learn more about the subject.

J. B. H.

*The Book of Life.* Edited by Newton F. Hall and Irving F. Wood. 3rd edition. Chicago: John Rudin & Co., 1946.

This is a new edition of an arrangement of the stories of the Bible, with an introduction to each section and with certain hymns and poems illustrating the text placed at the end of each volume. This series is well planned and should be helpful to church school teachers and pupils. The illustrations are remarkably interesting and helpful.

F. A. M.

*The Aleph-Bet Story Book.* By Deborah Peskin. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1946, pp. 176. \$1.50

This is an arrangement of Old Testament stories for Jewish children, with one story for each letter of the Hebrew alphabet, and intended for children of kindergarten and primary age. The plan is cleverly conceived and carried out.

F. A. M.

*Must Men Hate.* By Sigmund Livingston. Cleveland: Crane Press, 1944, pp. xviii + 287. \$1.00.

There are few popular books in existence that treat the social evil of anti-Semitism in as penetrating and factual a manner as this work which has now gone through several printings in its original Harper edition. Available finally in a low-priced edition, it is a book which should be distributed widely in our parishes.

In this his final book, Livingston, the founder of the Anti-Defamation League, has described vividly but without exaggeration the almost countless forms of anti-Semitic behaviour in our present day, in many instances relating these to major outrages against the Jews in the past. His historical grasp of the subject and dependence on sound sources greatly strengthens his case. Anyone who has taken pains to



become acquainted with the day to day experiences of Jews in this country will know that Livingston is reporting accurately the current scene.

It is unfortunate that a short chapter was included on Differences Between Judaism and Christianity. Although written by a learned Rabbi and in most respects acceptable, it would be wholly so to very few in our communion. It is an unnecessary chapter.

The great menace of anti-Semitism in our day, especially in the post-war world, gives this book a note of urgency that few popularly written books deserve.

D. R. H.

*The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers.* Volume III. By LeRoy Edwin Froom. Washington: Review and Herald, 1946, pp. 802. \$4.50.

Volumes I, II and IV of this monumental work have not yet appeared. They will deal with "Early Church Positions and Dark Ages Repudiation," "Pre-Reformation and Reformation Restoration," and "Nineteenth-Century Recovery and Consummation." This first volume to emerge deals with "Colonial and Early National American Exposition" and "Old World Nineteenth-Century Advent Awakening." Dr. Froom, a Seventh Day Adventist scholar, is concerned to trace the history of the expectation of Christ's second coming, and brings to his task an amazing knowledge of expository literature and of church history generally. He does not, however, attempt to set his materials in the context of the total historical development. His theological point of view is suggested by the frontispiece. It is the reproduction of a painting in which an angel in white points to the heroic statue of a warrior in Assyrian beard and short skirt. A cloud partially veils the figure above the ankles, and the caption of the picture states: "The nineteenth century revival of interpretation centered on the feet and toes." Those who do not share Dr. Froom's viewpoint will nevertheless be grateful that he fills up a gap in the history of biblical interpretation and provides an accurate chronicle of a side of church history too much neglected. This is an historical element that must be taken into consideration if one is fully to understand American Christianity.

S. E. J.

*Initiate the Heart.* By Sister M. Maura, S. S. N. D. New York: Macmillan, 1946, pp. vi + 46. \$1.75.

The title of the volume comes from a poem which includes these lines:

Initiate the heart to change  
for it is wiser so,  
accepting the splendor of the hour  
white with clematis or snow.

Fortify the will with peace,  
no season taking root,  
tranquil in mist, in warmth, in frost,  
each bears fruit.

The best of these poems are very good indeed, both in craftsmanship and in that white-hot perception of material and spiritual beauty which is the stuff of poetry.

S. E. J.

*The Parish Chest.* By W. E. Tate. Cambridge Univ. Press (N. Y.: Macmillan), 1946, pp. 346. \$4.75.

This work is a study of the records to be found in the parish chests of England. It describes the kinds of material covered by the manuscripts, and gives valuable information in understanding them. It is, indeed, the only work of its kind and should be of invaluable assistance to the parish historian.

Mr. Tate is an enthusiast for his subject and he has investigated many of the chests. His work provides a general introduction to the origins and nature of the English parish, a description of the actual chests, and extensive chapters on the ecclesiastical and civil records. Churchwardens' accounts, records dealing with charity, glebes, the King's Evil, poor law, highway maintenance, enclosures, and so on are all treated. In every case the author illustrates his survey with direct citations from the records. Thus the reader gains a summary and clear picture of the actual contents of the average parish chest.

The work concludes with a note on handwriting, a most useful glossary of technical terms, a list of the various archeological societies and clubs, a bibliography of some one hundred titles, and an index. There are, furthermore, some fifteen interesting photographs scattered throughout the text.

Mr. Tate has surely done the historian a service, and it may well be hoped that his



book will prevent further careless destruction of such records. They are the raw materials from which much ecclesiastical, social and economic history has yet to be written. While the records do not go far back into the middle ages (the earliest vestry books in Lincoln, for instance, start in 1542), historians of the 17th and 18th centuries will find a gold mine.

It is admittedly difficult in such a work to avoid presenting a compendium of miscellaneous information, but the net effect is not without value. One senses the continuity of English parish life through the vicissitudes of the Reformation and the Restoration. Changes developed slowly, and this helps to counterbalance the feeling of abrupt transition with which general histories often leave the reader.

All in all this is a most useful guide to those who want to know where to look and what to find in studying English parish life in the 17th and 18th centuries.

C. C. R.

*The New Testament Letters.* By J. W. C. Wand. Oxford Univ. Press, 1946, pp. ix + 220.

The present Bishop of London was formerly Archbishop of Brisbane, and the present book was published first in Australia. It is designed to make the N. T. Epistles more understandable by the rank and file of Bible readers, with the result (it is hoped) of encouraging more persons to "take up and read" the New

Testament. The author takes as his standard "the kind of language a Bishop might use in writing a monthly letter for his diocesan magazine, which, provided one's style is neither too stiff nor too colloquial, should offer a medium very like that of the original." This is quite true: there was a note of authority in Paul's letters, and in the others as well, which a Bishop's pastoral epistle to his diocese would convey; and there is affection and even familiarity, without the presuming on one hand or the contempt on the other that too much familiarity is said to breed!

The work is admirably done, not as a contribution to the scholarly exegesis of the epistles, but as a popular paraphrase. The late Geo. B. Stevens of Yale paraphrased Paul's letters, a half-century ago (Scribner's, 1898), and the performance was a brilliant contribution to exegesis; but Bp. Wand's purpose is different, and more modest. The style is colloquial at times: e.g., "Dear Dr. Luke sends greetings and so does Demas" (p. 111). The renderings of metrical or rhythmic passages, where "poetry" underlies the text, are not very successful. In spots the English is *very* English. And the attempt to date the epistles, and to save the Pastorals for Paul, and to view Hebrews as "A letter to Christians of Jewish race"—these efforts show that the Bishop's scholarship is somewhat "dated." But for its purpose, the book is useful enough, and we wish it a wide reading.

F. C. G.